EXCEPTIONS

Againſt a

VVRITING

OF

Mr. *R. BAXTERS*,

In Anſwer to ſome

ANIMADVERSIONS

Upon his

APHORISMS.

By Mr. *Chr. Cartwright* of *York*.

LONDON,

Printed for *Nevil Simmons* and *Jonath. Robinſon*, at the Princes-Arms and Golden-Lion, in St. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1675.

EXCEPTIONS

Against a

VVRITING

OF

Mr. R. BAXTERS,

In Answer to some

ANIMADVERSIONS

Upon his

APHORISMS.

By Mr. Gbr. Cartwright of York.

LONDON,

Printed for Nicol Simmons and Tomlin, Publishers, at the Princes-Arms and Golden-Lion, in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1657.

Exceptions againſt a Writing of Mr. R. Baxters, *in Anſwer to ſome Animadverſions upon his Aphoriſms.*

HOw Relations ſhould be *inter Entia & Nihil* I cannot ſee; For *Nihil* is *Non ens*; & *inter ens & non ens non datur medium.* *Page* 2. 1. 2.

Εὐδοκία is indeed for moſt part ſo taken, as to include Love and Good-will; yet it ſeems to be otherwiſe taken *Matth.* 11. 26. and *Luke* 10. 21. as *Dr. Twiſſe* obſerveth. And it is true, Εὐδοκία & *Beneplacitum* expreſs one the other: yet if we conſider the propriety of the words, both of them may well ſignifie the Will and Pleaſure of God concerning any thing whatſoever. It is obſerved, that the Lxx Interpreters deviſed the word Εὐδοκέω to expreſs the Hebrew *Ratſa*, which is as much as *Velle*; though it be often uſed for *Benevolum eſſe*. The Members of that diſtinction, [*Gratia gratum faciens*, & *Gratia gratis data*] fall one into another, as well as the Members of this, [*Voluntas Beneplaciti*, & *Voluntas Signi*] yet the diſtinction, though not ſo exact, may be uſeful. 4. *Vindic. Lib.* 1. *Part.* 2. *Sect.* 20.

1. What you intended, I know not; but you ſeem to ſpeak alike of all the Signs mentioned, *Aphor.* p. 3. *Ibid.*

2. I find *Aquinas* expreſs for this, that *Voluntas Signi* is but *Signum Voluntatis*; ſo that according to him *Voluntas Beneplaciti* ſeems indeed to ſignifie the whole Will of God, properly ſo called; and *Voluntas Signi* the whole Will of God alſo, ſo far forth as there is any ſignification of it. But however, I ſee not how you can hence infer, [then *impletio voluntatis beneplaciti de eventu, non eſt ſignum voluntatis beneplaciti de jure*]. This ſeems but a meer evaſion; it ſufficeth, that *Imple-* 3. *Part* 1. *Quæſt.* 19. *Art.* 11.

tio is *Signum Voluntatis de eventu*, as *Præceptum* is *Signum Voluntatis de Officio*.

Ibid. 1. When you say, that God doth permit, and more than permit the Wicked to amend; I suppose you mean, he doth command them: But is not this to take the word [permit] morally? Yet *pag.* 5. you say, That you speak all the while of Permission Natural, not of Moral Permission. 2. Permission is only made *Signum Voluntatis Dei de malo*. Thus *Aquinas*, *Permissio ad malum refertur, operatio autem ad bonum*. And *Maccovius*, *Objectum Voluntatis Permissivæ Dei est peccatum. Ita quidem est. Nam bonum, quod vult, vult Voluntate effectivâ, non permissivâ*. 3. That *Permissio Mali*, is *certum signum voluntatis Dei de malo quoad eventum*, I think is not to be denied. [*The Permissive Decree* (saith Bp *Davenant*) *concerning Sinful Actions, implyeth an infallibility of the Events so permitted*]. And he cites *Ruiz*, saying, *Positâ permissione, certissima est futuritio peccati, quod permittitur & omnium circumstantiarum, quæ permittuntur in illo*. So Dr. *Twisse*, *Posito decreto permittendi peccatum, non potuit homo à peccato abstinere: hæc tamen necessitas ex hypothesi cum libertate convenit*. *Camero* makes this the reason, why God doth foreknow evil, because he doth decree to permit it; which were no reason, if the Event did not certainly follow Permission. *Stat igitur sententia mea, Deus novit peccatum fore, quia decrevit permittere peccatum*. And he speaks divers times to this purpose. So *Maccovius*, *Deus præscit futura peccata. Ergo decrevit permittere. Nam quæ Deus præscit fore, ea præscit fore ex eo, quia decrevit*. The same Author also gives another reason; *Permissionem necessariò sequitur eventus: hoc est, quod permittit Deus, necessariò evenit.---Ratio etiam hoc ipsum evincit. Nam si Permissio nihil aliud est, quam gratiæ Dei substractio, sive privatio, quâ posita peccatum impediretur, ut à nobis antè ostensum est, fieri non potest, ut Creatura non labatur ubi Deus eam non sustentat: in Deo enim Movemur, vivimus, & sumus*. And again; *Non agitur de Permissione Ethicâ, quæ nihil aliud est quàm Concessio, sed de Physicâ, hoc est, de τῷ non-impedire. Quid verò sit disquiritur; Nos cum* Whitakero *dicimus, quòd sit privatio auxilii divini, quo posito peccatum impediretur*.

Part 1. *Quest.* 19. *Art.* 12. *Thes. Theolog. Disput.* 26.

Animad. p. 162.

Vindic. Lib. 1. *Part* 1. §. 3. §. 4. *Advers. Tilen.* pag. 193.

De Provident. Disp. 5. *Thes. Theolog.* part 1 *Disp.* 26.

Part 2. *Disp.* 14.

dicetur.----*Necessariò ergò sequitur Permissionem Lapsus: interim tamen Permissio non est causa Lapsus, sed antecedens solùm.* 4. *Austins* saying, which I cited, seems to hold out thus much, That as well God's *Permittere* as his *Facere*, is a sure sign of his Will concerning the Event. 5. I see not, that the Opinion of the necessity of Phyfical Efficient Predetermination doth deny God's Permission, seeing that Predetermination is *de Bono*, or *de Actione quâ talis*; but Permission is *de Malo*, or *de obliquitate Actionis*. Dr. *Twisse* in that very Digression which you mention, after a tedious Dispute against that Proposition, grants as much as (I think) *Perkins* did, or any need desire. For he grants, *Manifestò sequi peccati existentiam ex permissione ejus Divinâ*: He adds indeed, *Nequáquam sequitur ex naturâ Permissionis in genere, quod non paucis Theologis visum est, ut in superioribus accepimus, sed ex peculiari modo permissionis divinæ, constante sc. negatione gratiæ, quippe sine quâ peccatum à nemine vitari potest.* But this is that Permission which Divines speak of, as I have shewed. What he further adds, *de peccato definitè sumpto*, viz. that a bare Permission doth not infer the existence of it, seems little to the purpose. To his Instance about Formation, I Answer: There is a Restraining Grace as well as a Renewing; God vouchsafes the one to many, to whom he doth not vouchsafe the other; see *Gen.* 20. 6. I grant, that besides a meer Permission, there must be (as he speaks) *aliqua alia rerum administratio, secundum quam actus aliquis naturalis patretur, quæ sit proxima materia tali deformitati*: and that *quoties juxta Permissionem Divinam res aliqua sortitur effectum, toties Dei permissio non est solitaria, sed aliam Divinam Providentia gubernationem concomitantem obtinet.* But I suppose, that *Perkins* and others comprehend all under the name of Permission, that being it upon which Sin indefinitely considered, as *Twisse* himself confesseth, doth follow, though for the specification of the sin something more be required. The reason is, because *malum* is *privatio*, and so *in alieno fundo habitat*; therefore there cannot be *Permissio Mali*, but there must also be *Effectivus Concursus ad id, in quo Malum existit.* But for the thing it self *Twisse* is as clear (I think) as any. *Nec* (*inquit*) *minùs efficax esse*

Vindic. Lib. 2. Digr. 3. §. 3.

Vind. lib. 2 §. 2. §. 1.

esse dicimus decretum Dei de Permissione Mali, quam de Effectione Boni.

5. 1. I make *Voluntas Signi*, as put for *Signum Voluntatis*, to be but metaphorically *Voluntas*; yet I hold, that there is *Voluntas propriè dicta, quæ Signo indicatur*. 2. When I say [so far forth as the *Signum* is *præceptum*] it is only (as you might see) to shew, that *Voluntas Signi* (not *Signum Voluntatis*, but *voluntas cujus signum est Præceptum*) is the same with that which you call [Will of Precept]. 3. If *Dr. Twisse* do not extend it to the whole Law, but only to Precept, it may be he had not occasion to extend it further. Neither do you speak so fully in your *Aphorisms* as in this Writing. You mention indeed Legislative Will, but so as to call it also *Præceptive*, and to make the Object of it our Duty, *Aphor. pag.* 4. 4. That he doth take notice of the Immanent Will *de debito*, whereof *Præceptum* is *Signum*, is clear by the words which I cited, *viz. Precepta non indicant quid Deus velit esse Nostri Officii*, &c. Yea your self here say, *p.* 4. That he makes *Præcipere & Vetare* to be the Objects of God's Will; and that this clearly implies, that he took in the Immanent Acts, of which they were the Objects. You add indeed, That he so often contradicteth it by speaking otherwise, that you doubt it fell from him *ex improviso*: but I see no cause for any such surmise.

6. 1. Those words of yours [*to bestow good upon a Man*]
3. 9. I know not how I omitted; perhaps because I thought there was no need of expressing them. For however they must be understood; because God's Word and Truth is else ingaged in a Threatning as well as in a Promise. 2. You say, *Append.* p. 48. *That the absolute promise of a New Heart is made to wicked Men*: where you seem to speak of a Promise properly taken, as distinct from Prophesie or Prediction: Yet *Aphor. p.* 9. you say, That *Absolute Promises are but meer Predictions*; so that you seem not well reconciled to your self. But you best know your own meaning, only I think it meet that you express it so, as that none may have occasion to stumble at it.

Ibid. I see indeed, that you call it *Legislative Will*: But,
4. *Ibid.* 1. you make Legislative and Preceptive both one, and make the Object of it Man's Duty, *Aphor. p.* 4. So that you

you rather seem to restrain the word [Legislative] by the word [Preceptive], than to enlarge the word [Preceptive] by the word [Legislative]. 2. When you take the word [Legislative] largely, you make Precept and Promise distinct parts of it: So that still it is strange to me that you should say; *That Promises fall under the Will of Purpose, not of Precept.* For if the Will of Precept be taken strictly and properly, it is superfluous to say, That Promises do not fall under the Will of Precept: Neither on the other side is it true, if the Will of Precept be taken largely and improperly, *viz.* for the whole Legislative Will, which doth contain both Precept and Promise.

These two Questions (as you now make them) you comprise in one *Aphorism*, p. 15. and equally determine of both. For you say, *That the Life promised in the First Covenant, was in the judgment of most Divines* (to whom you incline) *only the continuance of that Estate that* Adam *was in in Paradise:* So that according to this Opinion, *Adam* was both to have continued in the same place, and also in the same Estate. I think still, he should have been changed in respect of both. *In* Adamo (*inquit* Barlous) *omnes in universum homines jus ad Cœlum habebant, & ipsi se stetissent, ipsum Cœlum unusquisque habuisset; adeò ut jus ad Cœlum in* Adamo *habuimus primævum, à Christo jus restitutum.* *Adam*'s continuance in the same Estate, is most clearly expressed by those whom you seem to follow; and how then can you say, That you did not meddle with that Question? And if he were to continue in the same Estate, no question he was also to continue in the same Place; For Heaven is no place for such an Estate as *Adam* had in Paradise. *Ibid.* *Ibid.* 15. *In Exercit.* 2.

I shall wonder if any will be so bold as to affirm, That *Adam* was Created *in Patriâ*, and not *in Viâ*. How was he to be tryed by his Obedience, if he were not *Viator*, but *Comprehensor?* It seems also strange that any doubt should be made, whether *Adam* being Created after the Image and Likeness of God, were capable of Heavenly Blessedness. 7.

The Reasons which I alleadged, notwithstanding any thing you say against them, seem cogent. 1. By the Second Death, you might see, I meant not the same de- *Ibid.*

gree, yet the ſame kind of puniſhment. The Scripture ſeems to ſpeak of ſeveral degrees of Hell-Torment, yet all is called the *Second Death*. And this Second Death, *viz.* Hell-Torment, *Adam* by his ſin became liable unto: therefore if he had not ſinned, he ſhould have enjoyed a Life directly oppoſite to that Death, *viz.* Coeleſtial Glory. The perpetual Death which *Adam* (without a Saviour) ſhould have ſuffered, was not a perpetual abiding in the Eſtate of Death, *viz.* a perpetual ſeparation of Soul and Body, or a meer privation of that Life he had before his Fall, but an enduring of eternal Torment; and ſo conſequently the Life promiſed upon condition of Obedience, was not a perpetuating of his earthly Life, but the fruition of Heavenly Happineſs. 2. I grant, God was able to change *Adam*'s State, not changing his Place; but it ſeems rather, that both ſhould have been changed. And though we know not the Nature of the Life to come, yet we know it is not ſuch a Life as *Adam* had in Paradiſe, to Eat, Drink, Marry, *&c.* 3. It is not in vain to ſay, How in an ordinary way of Providence ſhould there have been room for Men upon Earth, if *Adam* and his Poſterity, ſtill increaſing and multiplying *in infinitum*, ſhould there have continued for ever? Your Friend and mine Mr. *Blake*, having urged this Argument, ſeems to enervate it when he hath done, ſaying, [*But a thouſand of theſe God can expedite, when we are at a ſtand*]. But yet that without a Miracle it could be done, he doth not ſay, and he there profeſſedly oppoſeth you in this Point. Whereas you add, [*Eſpecially ſeeing God knew there would be no place for ſuch difficulties*] I know not to what purpoſe it is. For the Opinion, which I impugn, doth ſuppoſe that upon which ſuch difficulties do ariſe. 4. How ſhould Paradiſe be a Type of Heaven, if Man ſhould never have come to Heaven? If Heaven had not belonged unto him upon condition of his Obedience? Whereas you ſay, That *you little know where or what that Paradiſe was*; I do not well know what you mean. By [that Paradiſe] I ſuppoſe you underſtand (as I and others do) the Garden wherein *Adam* was placed: a place upon Earth for certain it was, and very pleaſant; yet ſuch a place as wherein *Adam* lived a natural Life, far beneath that happineſs which he was made capable of.

Of the Coven. *chap.* 5.

Thoſe

Thoſe words [*Thou ſhalt die*] being not only meant of a privation of the Life which he then enjoyed, but alſo of eternal torment; it follows, That the Life implicitly promiſed, is to be underſtood, not only of the continuance of that Life, but of Eternal Bleſſedneſs. *Ibid.* 5. *Ibid.*

I do not ſay that any now are altogether as *Adam* was under the Covenant of Works; but that ſome are ſo under that Covenant, that *in ſtatu quo* they have no part in the other Covenant, nor are guilty of contemning it, being utterly ignorant of it. *Ibid.*

To whom God doth not ſay, [*Believe in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and thou ſhalt be ſaved*] to them in effect he doth ſay [*Obey perfectly and live*]; or, [*If thou ſin, thou ſhalt die eternally*]. But there are many in the World to whom God doth not ſay [*Believe*, &c.] that Promiſe is altogether unknown unto them, they live and die without ever hearing of it, ſo that to them it is as if it had never been. Conſider (I pray) what the Apoſtle ſaith to this purpoſe, *Epheſ.* 2. 12. Might not the *Epheſians* have continued in that condition unto death? Do not many continue in the ſame Condition? I yeeld, that none are ſo under the Covenant of Works, but that if they repent and believe they ſhall have Mercy, and that by vertue of the New Covenant: but that which I ſtand upon is this, That the Covenant of Grace wherein Mercy is promiſed, being not revealed unto ſome, nor any way diſpenſed unto them, they cannot be ſaid to be under it, nor ſhall be judged as tranſgreſſors of it. *Ibid.*

Add, 1. Though the Covenant of Grace had never been, yet I ſee not but ſuch Mercies as the *Indians* enjoy, (ſetting aſide the poſſibility of partaking of the New Covenant) might have been enjoyed. Add, 2. Though the Covenant of Works vouchſafeth no pardon of ſin upon Repentance, yet ſurely it requiring perfect Obedience, conſequently it alſo requireth Repentance and turning unto God. Elſe if the Covenant of Grace had not been made, Man after his Fall, though plunging himſelf into ſin continually more and more, yet had contracted no more Guilt, nor incurred any greater Condemnation, than he did by his firſt Tranſgreſſion. Add, 3. Chriſt as Mediator ſhall judge even thoſe that never heard of any Salvation to be obtained by him; and conſequently he will not judge them as guilty of neglecting that Salvation. 8.

Chriſt

Christ judgeth wicked Men as Rebellious Subjects; but as rebelling (I conceive) only against the Law, not against the Gospel, they being such as never were acquainted with it. Add, 4. There are common Mercies, (which might have been though the New-Covenant had not been) the abuse whereof is sufficient to condemn; yet the improvement of them is not sufficient to save. If such Mercies as meer *Pagans* enjoy tend to their recovery, How then are such said to be ἄπιστοι μὴ ἔχοντες? *Ephes.* 2. 12.

Ibid. *Rom.* 2. 12. I cited to this purpose, to shew, That as they that sinned without the Law, shall perish without the Law; even so they that sinned without the Gospel, shall perish without the Gospel. That 2 *Thess.* 1. 7, 8. speaks not only of them that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, but also of such as know not God. The Apostle there seemeth to divide all the Wicked into two sorts, *viz.* such as know not God; so he describes the Gentiles, 1 *Thess.* 4. 5. and such as obey not the Gospel, &c. that is, such as having had the Gospel preached unto them, would not receive it, either not at all, or not sincerely. Yet Christ (he saith) will in flaming fire take vengeance on both, as well on the former as on the latter. And here also I have Mr. *Blake* agreeing with me, and so, as that he citeth this very place to the same purpose as I do. *Infidels* (saith he) *that were never under any other Covenant than that of works, and Covenant-breaking Christians, are in the same condemnation; there are not two Hells, but one and the same for those that know not God, and those that obey not the Gospel of Christ,* 2 Thess. 1. 8.]

Of the Coven. *Chap.* 5. *p.* 23.

Ibid. You pass by that which I alledged from *Rom.* 6. *ult.* viz. That death, which is the wages of sin, is opposed to Eternal Life, which is the happiness of the Saints in Heaven. *Ergo*, Death comprehends in it the misery of the Damned in Hell; and that (you know) is it which the Scripture calls the *Second Death.* I marvel therefore that you make no more of it than to say, [*Call it the first or second Death, as you please*]?

Ibid. The Argument drawn from the Bodies Co-partnership with the Soul, I take to be a good proof of its Resurrection. *Tertullian* surely thought so, or else he would not so frequently have used this Argument. *Age* (*inquit*) *scindant adversarii nostri carnis animaque con-*

De Resur. cap. 15.

textum

textum prius in vita administratione, ut ita audeant scindere illud etiam in vita remuneratione. Negent operum societatem, ut meritò possint etiam mercedem negare. Non sit particeps in sententia caro, si non fuerit in causâ. And again, *Secundum consortia laborum consortia etiam decurrant necesse est præmiorum.* And again also, *Non possunt separari in mercede* (*caro & anima*) *quas opera conjungit.* And surely that of the Apostle, 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. [*That every Man may receive the things done in the Body*] doth imply, That as the things were done in the Body, so also the Reward must be received in the Body. As for the dissolution of the Body which you speak of, it is but such a punishment as the Godly lie under as well as the Wicked, until the Resurrection. Therefore it is not probable, that it was the only punishment intended to the Body in the First Covenant. What-ever some new Philosophers may say, true Philosophy (I think) doth tell us, That it is the Body, which by the Sensitive Soul doth feel pain; even as it is the Eye, which doth see by the Visive Faculty. *Ibid.* c. 38. *Ibid.* c. 8.

You observe not (it seems) that I did but answer your *Queries*, which you made *Append.* p. 10. To the second, [*When should he have risen?*] I thought, and still think it sufficient to answer, That *Adam*, and so others, should either have risen in the end of the World, as now they shall, or when God should please to raise them. It is for you to prove that it could be neither the one way nor the other. *Ibid.*

How doth the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 15. seem to extend the Resurrection, which he speaks of, unto all, when he expressly limits it to those that are Christs? *vers.* 23. And when the whole discourse is about Resurrection unto Glory? *Expressè resurrectio Christi est causa resurrectionis eorum, qui ad Vitam Æternam suscitabuntur,* 1 Cor. 15. 20, 21, 22. To the same purpose also is that 1 *Thess.* 4. 14, *&c.* What the other Texts you speak of be, when you shew, I may consider then. This I grant, That the Wicked shall rise by the Power of Christ as Mediator, *John* 5. 28, 29. But that is not enough to prove, That had not Christ been Mediator, there should have been no Resurrection; no more than it follows, that otherwise none should have been condemned for sin, because now all 9. Maccov. *de statu primi ho.* Disp. 5.

all Judgment is committed unto Christ, *John* 5. 22, 27.

Ibid. I see no such difference betwixt them. For slaying before the foundation of the World, cannot be meant of

7. 24. actual slaying, but only of fore-ordaining to be slain.

Ibid. I mean Christ's Sufferings, as in obedience to his Father he submitted unto them. *This Commandment have I received of my Father*, said he, *John* 10. 18. Sufferings simply considered without Obedience, find no acceptance with God. No need therefore to except against the Phrase commonly used, [*Passive Obedience*] *i. e.*

Vide Gataker *cont.* Gomarum *p.* 14, 15. Obedience in Suffering. Christ had a Commandment to lay down his Life, it was the Will of his Father that he should do it, and in obedience thereto he did it.

Ibid. The Rule (*A quatenus ad omne*, &c.) doth not here

Ibid. 56. make for you, because it was not Christ's suffering meerly as obedience, but as such obedience, *viz.* Obedience in suffering, that was satisfactory. So that neither Suffering without Obedience, nor Obedience without Suffering would avail. *Sed quæ non prosunt singula, juncta juvant.*

Ibid. If only such Obedience be meant *Rom.* 5. 19. as is opposed to *Adam*'s disobedience, and therefore Active Obedience is meant, it will follow that only Active Obedience is meant, which you will not admit, because *Adam*'s Disobedience was only Active. But Christ's Obedience in Suffering, may be opposed to *Adam*'s Disobedience in Acting; and Christ's Passive Obedience (suffer me to speak so) may stand in opposition to Disobedience in general, as working a contrary effect, *viz.* Whereas Disobedience doth make Sinful, Christ's (Passive) Obedience doth make Righteous; and in that respect only doth the Apostle oppose Christ's Obedience to *Adam*'s Disobedience.

10. 1. The Apostle saying, That *Christ was made under*

Ibid. 58. *the Law*, it seems to be without doubt, That it was the Will of God that he should observe the Law. For is it not the Will of God that his Law should be observed by such as are under it? Yet Christ might observe the Law for some ends peculiar to himself, as for those ends he was made under it. Christ according to the flesh was a Jew, therefore meet it was he should observe the Jewish Law, otherwise he had been an offence unto them.

2. As

2. As Christ was not made Man for himself, so (it is true) he was not bound to observe the Law for himself. But thus you should not limit it to some Works; for all his Works were so for us, as he was *nobis natus, nobis datus*, Isa. 9. 6. Yet being made Man, as Man he was bound (I think) to perform that Obedience which God did require of Man. You say, That he used the Legal Ceremonies to shew his subjection: So say I; and this (I think) is against you, it being meant of such subjection as the Law required of all those that were under it. 3. If Christ were *sub Lege*, as the Apostle saith he was, then it was *ex Lege* that he observed those legal rites. Yet, I grant, it was *ex vi sponsionis propriæ*; so all that he did, so his very being made Man was. Whereas you say, [*Else the Law would have obliged him to the act and end together*]; I Answer, The Law doth oblige, according to the Will of the Law-giver, who might oblige Christ to it otherwise than he did others. I think the Ceremonial Observances, besides the Typical Nature of them, are to be considered as Religious Rites, whereby God was honoured and worshipped; and so Christ as Man was obliged unto them, Man being bound to honour and worship God, so as God doth require of him. That which you add of the burthen of Penal Actions, seems impertinent; For Penal Actions (I think) have the nature of Sufferings, and so they concern not the Point in Controversie betwixt us, which is only concerning Actions as Pious, not as Penal.

Your Reasons drawn from the Actions of Christ, receiving their chief Dignity from his chief Nature, &c. will reach further (I think) than you intend or desire, even to make all Christ's Active Righteousness to be satisfactory for us. And so indeed you seem to hold, *Aph.* p. 61. where you say, [*The Interest of the Divine Nature in all the Works of Christ, maketh them to be infinitely meritorious and satisfactory*]. Yet here, p. 10. you seem to restrain it to Penal Actions, and the burthen of tedious Ceremonious Worship, as you call it. For my part, I yet think, That as the Holiness of Christ's Nature, so also the Holiness of his Life was requisite to qualifie him for suffering, and (by suffering) satisfying for us. *Him that knew no sin, God made sin for us*, 2 Cor. 5. *ult.* *Such an High-Priest became us, who was holy,* *Ibid.* 11. 9. 59.

holy, harmleſs, &c. *Heb.* 7. 26. Mr. *Blake* (whoſe Judgment I do much value, though I cannot force mine own further than I am convinced) in this Point, concerning the Imputation of Chriſt's Active Righteouſneſs, ſeems to differ both from you and me; he ſaith, [*Chriſt had been innocent, though he had never come under the Law to have yeelded that obedience*]. But how Chriſt could have continued innocent, without yeelding obedience to the Law; or how being Man, he could be exempt from that Law, whereby the Creature is to ſhew his ſubjection to the Creator, I cannot ſee. He adds, [*His Perſon had not been as ours under the Law, unleſs of his own accord he had been made under the Law*]. He was not made Man (ſay I) but of his own accord; yet being Man, I conceive it was neceſſary that he ſhould be under that Law which God impoſed upon Man, and ſo both under the Moral Law, as the eternal Rule of Righteouſneſs; and alſo under the Ceremonial Law, as the preſcribed Rule of Worſhip. He adds further, [*Somewhat might be ſaid for the ſubjection of the Humane Nature in Chriſt, the Manhood of Chriſt, which was a Creature, but the Perſon of Chriſt, God-Man, ſeems to be above ſubjection*]. This I confeſs ſeems ſtrange to me; for the Humane Nature of Chriſt, though perſonally united to the Divine Nature, being ſtill a Creature, muſt needs be in ſubjection to him that made it; and therefore the Perſon of Chriſt, God-Man, though not as God, but as Man, muſt be under ſubjection. He goes on ſaying, [*We know the mortality of the Humane Nature, yet Chriſt had never died, unleſs he had made himſelf obedient unto death; neither needed to have ſerved, unleſs he had humbled himſelf*, Phil. 2. *to take upon him the form of a Servant*]. But Mortality is no neceſſary conſequent of Humane Nature, as ſubjection unto God is; and Chriſt taking upon him the Nature of Man, did *eo nomine* take upon him the form of a Servant; for Man muſt be Servant unto God, the Creature to the Creator. He bids, [See the *Aſſemblies Confeſſion of Faith*, Chap. 8. Sect. 5. and Dr. *Featlies* Speeches upon it]. Theſe Speeches I cannot now ſee, but I have ſeen them long ago, and was not ſatisfied with them. The words of the Aſſembly are ſuch, as that ſome queſtion may be made of the meaning of them, *viz.* Whether by

Of the Coven. c. 12. p. 78.

Vide Gataker*um noſtrum adverſus Lucium, Reſponſ. ad vindic.* Part. 2. Sect. 7. pag. 54 & *Et contra* Gomarum p. 4. & 22.

[Chriſt's

[Christ's perfect Obedience and Sacrifice of himself] be not meant one and the same thing, so that the latter words are exegetical to the former. But to return to you, who say, [*The Question should be, Whether it be only* Pœna Christi, *or* Obedientia *also, that satisfieth and meriteth*]? I think it is not simply *Pœna*, or *Obedientia*, but *Pœna Obedientialis*, and *Obedientia Penalis*.

1. The Creator is absolute Lord over the Creature, and so you grant no Work of the Creature can be meritorious. 2. You seem to make even the Actions of sinful men capable of being meritorious, though less properly. 3. Though Obedience be absolutely perfect, yet if absolutely due, it seems repugnant to *Luke* 17. 10. that it should be meritorious. 11. *Ibid.* 60.

The interest of the Divine Nature doth certainly put an infinite excellency into all Christ's Actions: Yet I see not how Christ's good Actions (I speak of meer Actions, which have no penality or suffering mixed with them) could properly be meritorious, they being otherwise due, supposing Man had not sinned, and so there had needed no satisfaction to be made for him. Though I am not of their mind, who think that the Son of God should have been incarnate, though Man had never sinned; yet I see no reason to doubt but so it might have been: Now *hoc supposito*, all Christ's meer Active Righteousness would have been due, but not his Passive Righteousness. *Ibid.* *Ibid.* 61.

I have divers times told you, That when we speak of Christ's Sufferings as meritorious or satisfactory, we are not to consider them meerly as Penal, but as Obedential also; so that your long Section hath nothing against me. 12.

My interpretation of these words, [*The Father judgeth no Man*] containeth indeed no absolute exclusion of the Father, neither can I admit any such exclusion; but an exclusion of him in some respect it doth contain. He that doth a thing, yet not immediately by himself, but by another whom he hath put in authority to do it, may be said in some respect not to do it. When the Egyptians cried to *Pharaoh* for Bread, he bad them go to *Joseph*, &c. *Gen.* 41. 55. *q. d.* I meddle not with these things, *Joseph* is to do all such matters. Yet *Pharaoh* indeed did all, though not immediately, but by *Joseph*. Your Arguments, *p.* 13. press not me, who never intended to deny that it belongs to Christ's Mediatorship, *Ibid.* 10. 65.

ſhip, and namely to his Kingly Office, to judge the World; only I ſhewed what I took to be the meaning of thoſe Texts, *John* 5. 22. & 27. Wherein I followed *Janſenius* and *Maldonate*, no abſurd Expoſitors, though Papiſts. And even *Calvin* and *Beza* alſo ſeem to agree with me in the excluſion of the Father, v. 22. *In Patre nihil mutatum eſt*, &c. *Eſt enim ipſe in Filio, & in eo operatur*, ſaith *Calvin*. And ſo *Beza*, *Negat Chriſtus à Patre adminiſtrari hunc mundum, ita, viz. ut* Judæi *arbitrabantur; qui Patrem à Filio ſeparabant, cum Pater contrà non niſi in perſonâ Filii manifeſtati in carne mundum regat.*

Calv. *in* John 5. 22. Beza *in eundem loc.*

14. *Ibid.* 67. You ſeem to make the preſent death of *Adam* a part of the rigorous execution of the Law, when you ſay, *Aphor.* p. 33. [*That the Sentence ſhould have been immediately executed to the full, or that any ſuch thing is concluded in the words of the Threat*, In the day that thou eateſt, &c. *I do not think; for that would have prevented both the Being, the Sin, and the Suffering of his Poſterity*]. How would this have been prevented, if *Adam*'s preſent Death were not included in the immediate and full execution of the Sentence, *i. e.* in the rigorous execution of it? Therefore though you argue, That the words of the Threat were not ſo meant, as that the Sentence ſhould immediately be executed to the full, yet your very Argument ſuppoſeth, That if the Sentence ſhould have been ſo executed, *Adam* ſhould preſently have died. Now though Chriſt had not died, yet this part of the rigorous execution of the Law might have been ſuſpended, and ſuppoſing the propagation of Mankind muſt have been: againſt this (ſo far as I ſee) you ſay nothing.

Ibid. 11. 68. I deſire to be as favourable an Animadverter as Truth will permit: but how under the name of Animadverſion I defend what you ſay, I do not ſee. If you had uſed the word [*Chaſtiſements*], it would not have freed you from mine Animadverſion. For I ſhew that Chaſtiſements are Puniſhments. And whereas you ſpeak of my great overſight, it is indeed your great miſtake; for I did not take thoſe words to expreſs your Opinion, only you ſeemed therein to allow the diſtinction betwixt Afflictions of Love and Puniſhments; this is it which I thought worthy of an Animadverſion.

You

You might see, that I make the Afflictions of God's Children in their Nature to be Evil, and a Curse, though not so to them, they being sanctified and working for their good. And I presume, those Divines whom you oppose, meant as both you and I do, though you interpret them otherwise. The difference here betwixt you and me is this; You allow their Expression, and dislike their meaning; I allow their Meaning, and dislike their Expression. They distinguish betwixt Chastisements and Punishments, which distinction in your *Aphorisms* you seem to allow, only disliking the Application of it. The distinction it self I dislike, though I think that some who used it, did not err in that which they intended in it. In the Contents of *Isa.* 27. there are these words, [*God's Chastisements differ from Judgments*], which words I hold incongruous. I like not that of Mr. *Kendal* against Mr. *Goodwin*, Chap. 2. p. 139. [*Punishment aimeth chiefly at the satisfaction of Justice, Correction at the amendment of the Offender*]. That is not true of all Punishments, see *Geld.* Lib. 6. cap. 14. Yet the meaning of those that used them, was not (I think) erroneous. 15.

I would give you no cause to quarrel with me. But is not this your own Argument? Do you not thus oppose the *Common Judgment* as you call it? [*They are ascribed to God's Anger*, &c.] *Aphor.* p. 70. Do you not there oppose God's Anger to his Love? Whereas Love and Hatred, not Love and Anger are truly opposite. God may be angry with us, and yet love us; yea therefore angry with us, because he loveth us. *Rev.* 3. 20. There is *Ira Paterna & Castigans*, as well as *Ira Hostilis & Exterminans*, Davenant *in Col.* 3. 6. Where those words of yours are, which you say I almost repeat, I do not know. I expressed mine own sence in mine own words; and my scope was only to correct that Opposition which you make betwixt Love and Anger, though I see that *Aphor.* p. 71. you speak of a mixture of Love and Anger, and say, *That there is no Hatred, though there be Anger.* My chief design in those Animadversions was, That in your Second Edition, which you promised, you might have occasion, if not to confirm your Assertions, yet to clear your Expressions. *Ibid.* 12. 70.

I know you oppose their sence that so distinguish, but their distinction simply considered you seem to admit; *Ibid.*

if you say that you do not, I am satisfied.

Ibid. Your words were of Affliction as Affliction, therefore
Ib. Ib. of Affliction in general. You say, *Aphor* p. 70. [*The very nature of Affliction is to be a loving punishment*, &c.] But you confess now, that you should have said [*Chastisement*]; and so I have my desire in this Particular, viz. your better expression.

Ibid. God is not the Father of the Unregenerate, though Elect,
Ib. Ib. in respect of Actual Adoption: But you know that *Ephes.* 1. 5. [*Having predestinated us to the Adoption of Sons*, &c.] God having loved such with an everlasting Love, viz. *Benevolentia*, though not *Complacentia*, no marvel if he afflict them in Love before their Conversion, viz. in order to their Conversion. But (you know) I
Rom. 9. 13. speak of Reprobates, and that it is written, [*Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated*]; Whether that import the Election of *Jacob*, and the Reprobation of *Esau*, I now dispute not; but I think it doth import God's love of the *Elect*, and his hatred of the Reprobate. *Deus omnes homines diligit* (inquit Aquinas) &
Part 1. Quest. 23. Art. 3. ad 1. *etiam omnes Creaturas, in quantum omnibus vult aliquod bonum: non tamen quodcunque bonum vult omnibus. In quantum igitur non vult hoc bonum quod est vita aeterna, dicitur eos odio habere, & reprobare.*

Ibid. Sanctified Suffering I hold to be *malum in se & suâ*
Ib. Ib. *naturâ*: and so I think do they, against whom you dispute in your *Aphorisms*: but though Suffering as Suffering be evil, yet as Sanctified it is not evil. *It is good for me that I was afflicted*, Psal. 119. 71.

16. Afflictions were then indeed to be loved, if they were good of their own Nature: but being only good as sanctified, we are not simply to desire them, but a sanctified use of them, and in that respect to rejoice in them, *Jam.* 1. 2, 3. *Rom.* 5. 3, 4, 5. Whereas you advise me to take heed of arguing thus, [*That which worketh for our good*, &c.] Where do I argue so? Rather thus; That which is sanctified to us, doth work for our good: and so though it be evil in it self, yet it is good to us. But Affliction is sanctified, &c.

Ibid. I am apt to oversee; but neither I, nor they (I think)
Ib. Ib. whom you first opposed, deny Sin to be the meritorious cause of Affliction, if that were all you aimed at in your Question.

What

What I mean by Conformity unto Christ, you might *Ibid.*
see by *Rom.* 8. 17. which I cited: I may also add 1 *Pet.* 4. 17. In these places the Scripture speaks of suffering for well-doing, which is acceptable with God, 1 *Pet.* 2. 19. Yet I grant, sin is the Root of all suffering; so it was of Christ's suffering, though not his sin, but ours. Only I thought it meet to put you in mind, that God in sending Affliction hath other ends than to punish sin, which the places alledged do shew, and so other places.

The Object of Love is not only present Good, There *Ibid.*
is a Love of Desire, as well as of Delight. The Spouse *13. 71.*
wanting Christ, was sick of Love, *Cant.* 5. 8.

I did not say, That Sanctified Suffering is not Evil, *Ibid.*
but that it is not evil as sanctified. Suffering, though sanctified, is suffering still, and so evil; but as sanctified, it is good, and not evil.

Those Arguments prove nothing against me, nor (I am 17.
perswaded) against those Divines mentioned in your *Ib. Ib.*
Aphorisms. It is granted, That Death in it self is Evil, an Enemy, a Punishment, to be feared, avoided, &c. Yet as it is sanctified, it is good, a Friend, a Mercy, to be desired, embraced, &c. 2 *Cor.* 5. 6, 7, 8. *Phil.* 1. 21, 23.

It is evil, 1. to them to whom it is not managed for *Ibid.*
their good. 2. To them also to whom it is so managed, *Ib.* 72.
but not as it is so managed.

Lex abrogata vim nullam habet obligandi, saith *Gro-* *Ibid.*
tius. Well, but we are not always so much to mind the *14. 79.*
strict propriety of words, as what they that use them do *De Satisf.*
mean by them. *fact.* p. 57.

That which you speak of our discharge before believing, might have been omitted, the question being about Believers, and so believing presupposed. *Ibid.*

Why the Justification and Condemnation of Believers 18.
doth not depend upon the Law, this (I think) is a suf- *15. 83.*
ficient reason, *Christ hath redeemed them from the Curse of the Law*, &c. *Gal.* 3. 13. *Si quid novisti rectius istis, Candidus imperti.*

The Law so concurs to the constitution of Guilt, as *Ibid.*
were there no Law, there were no Transgression. In the *Ib. Ib.*
other two Particulars, which follow, we do accord also.

Ibid. 16. 85. 1. Neither did I mean so, as if there were no explicit threatning to Unbelievers, but only this, That pardon of all sin being promised upon condition of believing, it implies that death is only threatned in case of unbelief. And tho there be in express threatning to Unbelievers; (*viz. Mark* 16. 16.) yet not only to Unbelievers. The threatning of death only to Unbelievers, is (I think) only implyed in the promise of Life made to Believers. 2. Neither did my words hold out any other meaning of 2 *Thess.* 1. 7, 8. than what you express. 3. The new Law or Gospel requiring Faith, the Fruit whereof is Obedience; it will condemn the disobedient, *i. e.* it will leave them to the condemnation of the Law, while they remain in that estate, though it hold out Mercy upon condition, that they believe and bring forth Fruit meet for repentance.

Ibid. 17. 86. Mr. *Lawson* I know for an able Scholar; but his reasons for that Position I do not know. If no Law, no sin; for *sin is a transgression of the Law*, 1 John 3. 4.

19. *Ib.* 89. Your saying, *Aphor.* p. 89. [*Whosoever will believe to the end, shall be justified*], may seem to imply, That though a Man believe, yet he remains unjustified, (as well as unglorified) until he go on and hold out unto the end: otherwise (I suppose) all will yeeld, That a Man must believe unto the end, that he may be justified unto the end.

Ibid. 18. *Ib.* 1. Though you deny that which I say your words seem so imply; yet what your meaning was, or is, you do not clearly shew. 2. You seemed to make the Life promised to *Adam*, only a continuance of his present enjoyments, which were as all upon the Earth, so many of them earthly, and none comparable to the happiness of the Saints in Heaven.

Ibid. *Ib.* 14. 1. Though there be several degrees of Damnation, yet all being the damnation of Hell, I do not think that there is such difference between one degree of Damnation and another, as there is betwixt the scratch of a Pin, and the pulling off a Man's flesh with Pincers. 2. If *Adam* had not sinned, he should have had that happiness which all those Privileges that you mention tend unto; and by his sin he forfeited all that happiness. Besides, when I spake of the identity of Punishment for kind though not for degree, I meant it of *Pœna Sensus*; and that

that (I conceived) was your meaning also.

No question but the Confirmation, Radication, and further degree of Grace is comprehended in those Promises, [*I will put my Law in their inward parts*, &c.] as a further degree of Spiritual Circumcision is promised, *Deut.* 30. 6. and a greater measure of the Spirit, *Luk.* 11. 13. But though the Circumstances of those Texts do so limit the Promises contained in them, (which yet may be questioned concerning *Deut.* 30. 6.) yet so do not (that I see) the Circumstances of that in *Jer.* 31. 33. and *Heb.* 8. 10. And therefore there is no reason to restrain these in that manner. *Ampliandi favores.* Besides, it is certain, Man can perform no condition required of him, except God work it in him, 2 *Cor.* 3. 5. *Phil.* 2. 13. *Ibid.* *Ib.* 91.

By Relative Change you mean Justification and Adoption: Now I think it is no hard matter to prove a real change in any, in whom this relative change is, *i. e.* That they that are justified and adopted, are also sanctified. 1. They that are justified and adopted, are Christs, *Gal.* 3. ult. *Ergo*, they that are justified and adopted, are sanctified. For so are they that are Christs, *Rom.* 8. 9. Take the Syllogism, if you please, thus; They that are * Christs, are sanctified: But they that are justified and adopted, are Christs. Therefore they that are justified and adopted, are sanctified. 2. They that are in a state of Salvation, are sanctified, 2 *Thess.* 2. 13. *John* 3. 3, 5. But they that are justified and adopted, are in a state of Salvation, *Tit.* 3. 7. *Rom.* 8. 17. *Ergo.* Hear one with whom you are acquainted, and whom I shall have occasion to cite afterward, *viz.* Wotton, *Ut regni (inquit) cœlestis hereditatem adipiscamur, & venia peccatorum, & sanctimonia opus est, — Quâ enim ratione heres esse vitæ æternæ intelligatur, qui immundus est?* And lest you should put this off, and say, That Sanctification indeed is requisite before any can enter into the possession of Eternal Life, but not before they can have a right unto it; he adds, *Remissione igitur sive condonatione opus est ad hæreditatis jus obtinendum: Sed nequaquam in illâ sunt omnia. Etenim (ut paulò antè significavi) accedat etiam oportet regeneratio, per quam sanctimoniâ imbuamur. Quare Christus factus est nobis & justitia, & sanctificatio*, 1 Cor. 1. 30. For the Arguments which you mention in Mr. *Bedford*'s Book, if you had propound- *Ibid.* *Ib.* 95. * *Viz.* By actual relation unto him. *De Reconcil.* Part 2. Lib. 2. Cap. 22.

ded any of them, I should have considered how to answer them. Now as you only refer me to that Book for Arguments against my Opinion, so shall I refer you to another Book for answer to those Arguments, viz. Mr. *Baxter's* lately published.

20. Nay indeed, if Baptism be a Seal of remission of sins, then remission of sins (I think) is not the end of Baptism. For the thing must be, before it be sealed, *i. e.* confirmed. Though Baptism therefore be ordained to this end, to seal remission of sins, yet none can make this use of it, until they believe, and so have their sins remitted. Neither doth this make for *Anabaptists*, for Circumcision was of the same nature, *Rom.* 4. 11. Yet were Infants circumcised. [*Not all that are baptized* (saith Bp. *Downam*) *are truly justified*]. And again, [*It is not necessary, that every one baptized, should presently be regenerated, or justified: but Baptism is a Seal to him of the Righteousness of Faith, either to be applied by the Holy Ghost to the Elect dying in infancy, or to be apprehended also by Faith in them, who living to years of discretion, have grace to believe*]. Again also, [*The* Papists *themselves teach, That the Sacraments do not confer Grace* ponenti obicem mortalis peccati; *but all that come to Baptism, are guilty* (if not justified before) *of mortal sin, not only* adulti, *who to their original sin have added their own personal transgression, but Infants also, who besides their original corruption, in respect whereof they are mortally dead in sin, stand guilty of* Adam's *most heinous transgression*]. 2. Baptism is as well a Seal of Sanctification, as of Remission of Sins; for it seals the whole Covenant, and all the Promises contained in it. And as Circumcision signified and sealed the taking away of the Foreskin (or superfluity of naughtiness, as St. *James* speaketh, *Chap.* 1. 21.) of the Heart, so doth Baptism signifie & seal the washing away of the filthiness, as well as of the guiltiness of it. Indeed Mr. *Meade* in one of his *Diatribæ*, would have the thing signified in Baptism, to be only the sanctifying Grace of the Holy Ghost; wherein I cannot subscribe unto him. Whereas you speak of an External Covenant, as some call it; some may express themselves one way, some another, yet all mean the same thing. For my part, I do not use to speak of an External Covenant, but of an

Of Perseverance, *ch.* 12.

Exter-

External Being in the Covenant, which is all that ordinarily we can be assured of in respect of others, and which is enough for admittance to the Sign and Seal of the Covenant. The People of the Jews, until by professed unbelief they fell away, were generally in the Covenant, *Rom.* 9. 4. even in that Covenant, which they that were Aliens from, had no hope, *Ephes.* 2. 12. Yet many of them were but externally in the Covenant, *Rom.* 9. 6, 27, 29. You labour in vain, when you seek to evade that Text, *Rom.* 8. 9. How should any be actually Christs, except they be united to him? And how united, but by the Spirit? 1 *Cor.* 6. 17. And if you meant (as you say) only of Saving Relations, Can a Saving Relation be put upon any, and yet no Saving Work wrought in them? Neither truly is a meer profession such a real change, as I supposed you did mean, *viz.* a change of the Heart, whereby one is made a new Creature.

I think that properly there are not distinct Laws, from whose distinct condemnations we must be freed: That the Gospel doth not condemn any, but only leave some to the Law to be condemned by it, though their Condemnation by reason of the Gospel, as of every Mercy neglected, or abused, will be the greater. 23. *Ibid.* 103. *Ad.* 1.

The Father (as I have said before) doth judg, though by Christ, see *Acts* 17. 31. And however, I see not how you can conclude any thing to the purpose by this Argument. *Ibid.* *Ad.* 2.

If for every several Accusation there must be a several Righteousness, then there will be need of infinite Righteousnesses, seeing there may be infinite accusations. But one Righteousness, *viz.* that of Christ's Satisfaction for us, will take off all Accusations brought against us; else how doth the Apostle say, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge, &c. Rom.* 8. 33, 34. Indeed the Promise is made upon condition of believing, and therefore the not performing of the Condition, debars from benefit of the Promise. But this (I conceive) is not properly a new Accusation, but only a making good of the former accusation, we having nothing to shew why it should not stand in force against us. Your self did well distinguish p. 22. betwixt a Condition as a Condition, and a Condition as a Duty. Now Faith as a Condition, is required in the Gospel, but as a Duty in the Law; For the Law requires 24. *Ad.* 3.

us in all things to obey God; that is comprehended in the first Precept, therefore it requires us to believe in Christ, God commanding it. Else not to believe, were no sin; *for sin is a transgression of the Law*, 1 Joh. 3. 4. Now as Believing is a Duty, so not-believing doth afford matter of Accusation, and cause of Condemnation: But as Believing is a Condition, so Not-believing doth only leave the Accusation otherwise made in force against us; and for sin, whereof we are accused and found guilty, leaves us to condemnation. Thus (I think) are those Texts to be understood, *John* 3. 18. and *ult.* Whereas you say, That *the Accusation may be three-fold*, truly in that manner it may be manifold: But indeed the Accusation is but one and the same, *viz.* that we are *Non-credentes*: For *Pagans* do not so much as appear, and *Hypocrites*, are *no* Believers, as believing is a receiving of Christ, and that is the believing by which we are justified.

* Solifidians are and * Solifidians do but appear to be Believers.

Ibid. Ad. 4. For the several Sentences from whence you argue; 1. You urged *Joh.* 5. 22. to prove that God Creator judgeth none. 2. How are any freed from the Sentence of the first Law, but by the benefit of the New Law? therefore I see no ground for that which you seem to insinuate, *viz.* That we must first be freed from the Sentence of one Law, and then of another. Indeed I do not see, That the Gospel hath any Sentence of Condemnation distinct from the Law; only it doth condemn Unbelievers, in that it doth not free them from that condemnation which by the Law is due unto them.

Ibid. Ad. 5. That there is a sorer punishment, as of a distinct kind, than that Death threatned *Gen.* 3. you do not prove, neither (I presume) can it be proved. There are (I grant) several degrees of that Death, yet all of the same kind, *viz.* The loss of Heavenly Happiness, and the enduring of Hell-Torment. And if there must be a several Righteousness for every several degree of Punishment, there must be more Righteousnesses than you either do or can assign.

Ibid. Ad. 6. I say as before, I do not think this, [*Thou art an Unbeliever*] (I speak of Unbelief as a not-performing of the Gospel-Condition) to be a new Accusation, but only a

Plea

Plea why the former ſhould ſtand good, *viz.* that we are ſinners, and ſo to be condemned by the Law, becauſe the benefit of the Goſpel which we lay claim to, doth not belong unto us, we not performing the condition to that end required of us.

Whereas you ſay, [*We are devolved to the New Law before our Juſtification is compleat*]. Are we not devolved to it for the very beginning of our Juſtification? So again, [*Chriſt's Satisfaction is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs, &c. But the New Covenant gives the perſonal Intereſt*]. Doth not the New Covenant give Chriſt alſo, in whom we have intereſt? I note theſe Paſſages, becauſe your meaning in them perhaps is ſuch as I do not ſufficiently underſtand. *Ibid.*

I ſay ſtill, Here is no occaſion properly of a new Accuſation, but only of a *removens prohibens*, a taking away of that which would hinder the force of the former Accuſation. And ſo there is no new Righteouſneſs of ours required unto Juſtification, but only a Condition, without which we cannot have intereſt in Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, that thereby we may be juſtified. *Ibid.*

In your *Aphoriſms* you ſpeak only of a Two-fold Righteouſneſs requiſite unto Juſtification; now you ſpeak of a Two-fold Juſtification neceſſary to be attained. But the Scripture ſpeaks of Juſtification by Chriſt, and Juſtification by Faith, as of one and the ſame Juſtification, *Acts* 13. 39. *Rom.* 5. 1. *Ibid.*

The Second Cauſe, (as you call it) *viz.* [*Whether the Defendant have performed the condition of the New Covenant*] is indeed this, Whether he have any thing truly to alledge, why upon the former Accuſation he ſhould not be condemned? And ſo he muſt be juſtified indeed by producing his Faith, (and ſo his ſincere Obedience to teſtifie his Faith) yet not as a new Righteouſneſs of his own, but only as intitling him to Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, as that whereby he muſt be juſtified. 25.

Whereas you ſpeak of a Three-fold Guilt, *viz.* [1. *Reatus culpæ.* 2. *Reatus non-præſtita Conditionis.* 3. *Reatus pœnæ propter non præſtitam conditionem*]. 1. As *Omne malum eſt vel Culpa, vel Pœna*, ſo *omnis reatus* ſeems to be ſo too. 2. The not-performing of a Condition, as a Condition, brings no new guilt of Puniſhment, (if it did, ſurely it were *Culpa*, and ſo the ſecond Member *Ibid.*

yet falls in with the first) but only the loss of the Remedy, or Reward promised upon the performing of that Condition; though the not performing of the Condition as a Duty, will bring a new guilt of Punishment. 3. Therefore the *Reatus pœnæ* is not properly *ob non præstitum Conditionem*, but *ob culpam admissam*, which *Reatus* doth remain in force, because the Condition required for the removing of it, is not performed.

26. We must take heed of straining Law-terms too far in Matters of Divinity. I see not how the firmness of my title to Christ's Righteousness for Justification, may properly be called my Righteousness, whereby I am justified, though the firmness of that title may be questioned, and must be proved; yet if it prove false, it is not that properly which doth condemn, (I speak of the Meritorious Cause of Condemnation) but sin committed against the Law, is that which doth put into a state of Condemnation, and for want of that Title, there is nothing to free from Condemnation.

Ibid. The Obligation unto Punishment is not dissolved by Satisfaction made by Christ, as to Unbelievers, because for want of Faith, the Satisfaction of Christ is not imputed unto them.

Ibid. 1. For that far greater Punishment, which you speak of, I have said enough before. 2. Is that Non-liberation from former misery a distinct punishment from that misery? Though the former misery may be aggravated by neglect of that which would procure a liberation from it. If God had never made a New Covenant, there had certainly been a Non-liberation from that misery, which the breach of the first Covenant did bring upon us; and under that misery they must lie for ever, who neglect the Remedies provided for them; and as their neglect doth aggravate their sin, so will it encrease their Condemnation.

Ibid. The Immunity doth result from the New Covenant, the Penality from the Old, unto which Unbelievers are left, the New Covenant affording them no Remedy by reason of their unbelief: and the Penality of the Old Covenant is accidentally increased by the New Covenant, in that by neglect of its Remedy sin is increased.

Ibid. I am of this opinion, That the New Covenant hath no other Penality, but that it doth leave Unbelievers to the

Penality of the Old Covenant, and by accident increase the same.

If that Penality be but the same Death, it hath no more than the former; neither can that Act of Grace be properly said to appoint a new Punishment, but only to leave to the former Punishment, as not delivering from it. You speak indeed of Double Torments appointed by that Act for such as do reject it; but so (I think) the Similitude doth not hold. For I see not, that the Covenant of Grace doth so, but only (as I have said) leave some upon their not performing the Condition required of them, to the Punishment appointed by the Covenant of Works; which Punishment will be the sorer, as Sin by neglect of Grace offered is the greater. *Ibid.*

3. Though our Mediator do not believe, repent and obey for us, but we our selves must believe, repent and obey, yet it doth not follow that our believing, repenting and obeying, is that Righteousness by which we are justified. *Ibid.*

4. Though we be not guilty of not performing the Condition of the New Covenant, yet this is not properly our Righteousness, by which we are justified, though without it we cannot be justified, because not partake of Christ's Righteousness. 27.

5. The rejecting of Christ may be considered 1. As the receiving of Christ is a Duty Commanded. 2. As the receiving of Christ is the Condition of Pardon and Salvation offered. In the former respect, the rejecting of Christ is properly a sin, and so against the Law, though aggravated by the Gospel, in that Christ is rejected notwithstanding all the benefit to be obtained by him. That the Law doth not speak of Christ, is nothing; for it speaks of obeying God in all his Commands, and so implicitly it speaks of receiving Christ, when God doth command it. In the latter respect the rejecting of Christ (I think) doth not properly bring a new guilt, but only continue and aggravate the former.

6. But *recurrit quæstio*, viz. Whether the New Law doth require the Condition as our Righteousness: it seems to me to require it only to that end, that Christ's Righteousness may be imputed unto us, and that so by that Righteousness we may be justified.

7. Faith, as a Duty, is a Conformity to the Law, though

though a partial and imperfect Conformity unto it; and ſo there's no being juſtified by it. As a Condition, it is a conformity to the Goſpel, but no Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified, though a Condition upon performing of which we are juſtified by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs.

8. I deny that there is any other condemnation of the Goſpel, but only a not-freeing in ſome caſe from the condemnation of the Law.

9. The Condition being conſidered meerly as a Condition, and not as a Duty, to object that we have not performed the Condition, is not to bring a new Accuſation, but only to take away the Plea, why the old Accuſation ſhould not prevail againſt us.

10. The performance of the Condition of the New Covenant, being deſigned to that uſe, which you mention, *viz.* [*to be the ſinners ſelf-denying acknowledgment of his ſin and miſery, and inſufficiency to deliver himſelf*] it doth hence rather follow, that properly it is not our Righteouſneſs, by which we are juſtified, though it be required of us to that end, that we may be juſtified by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs.

11. That the Condition is not of ſo large extent as the Duty commanded, ſeems not to the purpoſe, the Queſtion being of the Condition as a Condition, not as a Duty. Faith as a Duty (I grant) is part of our Perſonal Righteouſneſs; but that is not it by which we are juſtified.

12. As the Condition is a Condition, and no more, ſo the performing of it is no *Juſtitia* at all: as it is a Duty, ſo indeed the performing of it is *Juſtitia particularis, & ſecundum quid*, as the performing of every Duty is: but ſuch a *juſtitia* I dare not rely on for Juſtification. Whereas you ſay, *That Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is not ſimply our Univerſal Righteouſneſs*; it is true, if by [ſimply] you mean [*abſolutè, & nullâ interpoſitâ conditione*] otherwiſe our Univerſal Righteouſneſs it is, ſo that we have no need of any other Righteouſneſs for our Juſtification, though we have need of ſome thing to that end, that we may partake of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and be juſtified by it.

28. 13. The Goſpel as diſtinct from the Law, doth ſhew us our Remedy; the Law as diſtinct from the Goſpel, doth

doth prescribe unto us our Duty. Or if the Gospel also doth prescribe unto us our Duty, yet no other Duty, though upon other terms than the Law doth prescribe. However, though the performing of the Duty be in some sort our Righteousness, yet it is not that Righteousness by which we are justified. Still I distinguish of Believing considered as a Duty, and considered as a Condition. As a Duty, it is our Righteousness, but not that whereby we are justified; as a Condition, it is that whereby we are justified, but not our Righteousness; it is only that whereby we receive Righteousness, *viz.* the Righteousness of Christ, that Righteousness indeed by which we are justified. Whereas you say, [*The difference of the two Laws or Covenants, is the main ground which shews the necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness*]. The necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness is not denied, but only the necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness unto Justification.

This Two-fold Justification seems to be a new conceit. *Ibid.* I remember not that you spake any thing of it in your *Aphorisms*; neither (I think) will it easily be granted because of your Positions and Suppositions, but rather they will be rejected, as inferring that which is not to be admitted. For truly where the Gospel doth speak of more Justifications than one, (in that sence as we treat of Justification) I am yet to seek.

From a Two-fold Covenant you infer a Two-fold Justification. *Ibid.* But is there a Two-fold Covenant, by which we are or may be justified? I conceive, we are justified only by the New Covenant. For *by the Deeds of the Law* (the Old Covenant) *shall no flesh be justified*, Rom. 3. 20. See also *Acts* 13. 39.

1. To be accused as an Unbeliever, and a Rejecter of *Ibid.* Christ, &c. is to be accused as a sinner, and as one that did not continue in all things written in the Law to do them. For else Unbelief and rejecting of Christ were no sin; that Christ is not spoken of in the Law, is nothing, as I have shewed before. 2. That Accusation (that a Man is an Unbeliever, and a Rejecter of Christ) if it be made good, doth leave a Man to the Law, and makes all its Accusations to be in force against him, with aggravation of his Sin for contempt of Mercy.

For

29. For the Authors which you cite, I can examine but few of them, because I have them not. *Bradshaw* (so far as I see) makes nothing for you. He saith, *Bona opera quodammodo justificare dicuntur, quòd fidem, ipsamque adeò justificationem nostram arguendo, ac comprobando, utramque ista ratione justificent.* This is but what others say, That Faith doth justifie the Person, and Works justifie the Faith: and that is indeed no more than what all Protestants do say, *viz.* That Works declare and manifest Faith to be such as whereby the Person is justified: and that therefore a Man is said to be justified by Works, because thereby he appears to have Faith, whereby he is justified.

De Justif. c. 24. §. 21.

Ibid. §. 23. Again he saith, *Obedientia non minùs quàm ipsa (ex quâ oritur) fides ad salutem æternam est nobis necessaria, utpote sine quâ justitiam Christi imputatam prodesse nobis posse spes nulla existat.* This is but what Protestants generally acknowledge, That Obedience is necessary as a Fruit of Justifying Faith; so that without Obedience it is in vain to think of being justified by Christ's Righteousness: Yet is not our Obedience therefore a Righteousness, by which we are justified.

Ibid. §. 25. Again he saith, *Cujuslibet Christiani, quicum actu Deus in gratiam rediit, duplex est Justitia; Imputata una, Inhærens altera.* But he doth not say, That we are justified by Inherent, as well as by Imputed Righteousness: He is as far from that as other Protestants generally are; and other Protestants generally are as ready to assert the necessity of that Two-fold Righteousness, as he is.

Ibid. §. 26. Again he saith, *Per justitiam Christi nobis imputatam non possimus dici absolutè sive omni modo justi,* &c. He means, We are not freed from future Obedience, though we be freed from the guilt of Disobedience. This (except Libertines) none, I presume, will deny. But all this, as to the Controversie betwixt us about a Two-fold Righteousness requisite unto Justification, is (that I see) just nothing. But concerning *Bradshaw*, and the places which you point at in him, I observe, that §. 21. is twice so figured, and therefore which of the two you did intend, may be a question. I before noted what is in the former; but in the latter there is something, which peradventure you intended, though I judg it as little to your

your purpose as the rest. He saith, *Nova Nostra Obedientia pro gradu suo, & mensurâ, etiam justitia nostra dicitur, quâ & formaliter, inhærenter, habitualiter, sivè ex operibus justi (pro ipsius modulo) coram Deo reiam verè dicamur; utpote cujus ratione pro justis ex parte à Deo ipso censeamur, cujusque intuitu etiam in foro divino aliquo modo (si id opus esset) justificari possimus.* But, 1. you see what mincing of the matter here is; [*Pro gradu suo & mensurâ: Pro ipsius modulo: ex parte: Aliquomodo: si id opus esset.*] This is not to the Point we have in hand, who speak of universal and entire Justification. 2. Here he makes against you; for he clearly makes Inherent Righteousness imperfect, [*cujus ratione pro justis ex parte à Deo censemur*] whereas you hold all Righteousness to be perfect, or none at all. What you mean by citing *Wotton de Reconcil.* part 1. lib. 2. cap. 18. I cannot imagine, for nothing do I there see for you, but much against you, though touching other Particulars in debate betwixt us. As in the very beginning of the Chapter; *Ex efficientibus Justificationis causis reliqua est Fides, quam Instrumenti locum obtinere diximus.* And the title of the Chapter is, *Quomodo Fides Causa Instrumentalis Justificationem Nostram operetur.* And *pag.* 190. he cites and approves that of *Damam, Fides sola est, qua nobis jus tribuit ad omnes Dei promissiones in Evangelio consequendas,* &c. And *pag.* 193. that of our Church; *Nihil ex hominis parte flagitatur ad ipsius justificationem, præter veram & vivam fidem.* And immediately after he adds; *Neque tamen hac Fides spem, dilectionem, timorem, pœnitentiam excludere censenda est, quasi ad eum, qui justificandus est, non pertinerent, sed hæc omnia ab officio justificandi (N. B.) significantur penitùs excludi. Atque hoc quidem justificandi munus soli Fidei convenire, his rationibus ostendo,* &c. The rest of the Chapter is taken up with those Reasons. Now what there is for your purpose, judg you. The next place which you refer me to, is more punctually cited, *viz. part* 2. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 35. *pag.* 383. but neither there do I find any thing that makes for you. He there answers *Bellarmine*'s Arguments, whereby he would prove, That *Fides est solus assensus, non etiam fiducia:* But what is this *ad rhombum?* I know not whether you may lay hold on those words,

words, *Fidem Justificantem, sive quatenus Justificat, non esse unam virtutem, nec ullam quidem virtutem, sed justificare omnimo, & solummodo ex officio & loco, qua Deus misericors illi sponte & liberè concessit, ut dixi parte 1. lib. 2. cap. 28.* So it is printed, but it should be *cap.* 18. for there are but nineteen Chapters of that Book. What you can gather from this (if this were it you aimed at) I cannot tell, especially he referring us to the other place before mentioned, where there is much against you, but nothing (I think) for you. And as little for your purpose do I meet with in *part 2. lib. 1. cap. 7. pag.* 144. where he only saith, *Accedat etiam oportet, ut idonei simus, quibus aditus ad Cœlum pateat, habitualis justitia sive Sanctitas, de quâ, &c. Mat. 5. 8. Denique vita etiam sanctimoniâ, & bonis operibus opus est, ut Regnum Cœleste comparemus,* Heb. 12. 14. Matth. 25. 34, 35. But doth he say, That this Habitual Righteousness (which he maketh all one with Holiness, therein opposing you as I do) is requisite unto Justification? Otherwise that it is requisite, Who doth question? Whereas you next cite *part. 2. lib. 1. cap. 5. p. 127. n. 3, 4.* I doubt whether you did well observe what the Author there meaneth. He only answereth an Argument of *Hemingius*, denying that which (he saith) *Hemingius* supposeth, *viz. Eandem justitiam esse viam ad vitam æternam, cum in Lege, tum in Evangelio.* But of a Two-fold Righteousness he there makes no mention; not (I say) of a Two-fold Righteousness required of us at all, much less required of us, that thereby we may be justified. He saith indeed, *Quid enim si Lex Dei in decalogo sit norma illius justitiæ, quæ est via Vitæ Eternæ? Si præter hanc in Lege præscripta sit alia via in Evangelio constituta, quid impedit, quo minus justificetur quispiam sine Legis impletione?* He doth not mean, That the Righteousness prescribed in the Law, is one Righteousness, and the Righteousness constituted in the Gospel another Righteousness, whereby we are justified; but that we are justified only by this latter, and not at all by the other. He was far from thinking of your Legal and Evangelical Righteousness, as being both necessary unto Justification; he only asserts Evangelical Righteousness as necessary in that respect, which Righteousness he makes to consist meerly in remission of

sins.

ſins. See *part.* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. *n.* 12. & *cap.* 3. *per totum.* To the very ſame purpoſe (*i.e.* nothing at all to yours) is that *Ibid. cap.* 6. *p.* 138. *n.* 2. where he taxeth *Hemingius* for taking it as granted, *Nullam eſſe juſtitiam, vel injuſtitiam, niſi in Lege præſitâ, vel non præſitâ:* And then he ſaith, *Nam ſi alia ſit juſtitia, quæ Lege non contineatur, fieri poteſt, ut alia etiam ſit via Æterna Vitæ conſequendæ.* He doth not grant (as you ſeem to underſtand him) that *Juſtitia, quæ in Lege continetur eſt una juſtitia, quæ ad Juſtificationem à nobis requiritur*; for that indeed he denies, and ſaith, That there is another Righteouſneſs now in the Goſpel ordained for that end; and remiſſion of ſins (as I ſaid) he makes to be that Righteouſneſs, even the only Righteouſneſs by which we are formally juſtified. Immediately after indeed he adds that which I cannot allow; *Verum nec peccatum quidem Legis in Decalogo cancellis circumſcribitur.* This is not directly to the Point now in hand; yet becauſe it may reflect upon it, and ſomewhat we have about it afterward; I therefore think meet to note it by the way, and ſay, That if it be as he ſaith, then (it ſeemeth) St. *John* did not give us a full definition of ſin, when he ſaid, *Sin is a tranſgreſſion of the Law*: but of that more hereafter. *Wotton*'s Argument is of ſmall force; *Fides* (*inquit*) *in Chriſtum crucifixum non præcipitur in Lege*: but I have before him, ſhewed that it is otherwiſe. He himſelf preſently after cites that, 1 *John* 3. 23. [*This is his Commandment, That we believe*, &c.] Now the Law contained in the Decalogue, requires us to do whatſoever God commandeth; for if we do not ſo, we do not make him our only Lord God, as the Law requireth. That the Apoſtle doth oppoſe (as he ſaith) Faith to the Law, *Gal.* 3. 12. makes nothing for him. For Faith, as a Duty, is required in the Law, though as a Condition it be required only in the Goſpel. Neither doth that advantage him, which he alſo objecteth, That the Law hath nothing to do with Chriſt as Mediator, *Gal.* 5. 4. For though the Goſpel only hold out Chriſt as Mediator to be believed in; yet Chriſt being ſo held out, the Law doth require us to believe in him. For the Law doth require a belief of every Truth that God doth reveal, and a performance of every thing that God doth enjoyn. Now for *Lud. de Dieu*, If the Juſtification which 1 *Joh.* 3. 4.

he speaks of, *Quâ ut sanctificati ac regeniti absolvimur à falsis Diaboli & improborum criminationibus*, be meant of some particular Acts, of which we are accused, it is but such a Justification as the Reprobates themselves may partake of, who may be accused of some things whereof they are not guilty. See *Bradshaw de Justif. cap.* 25. If it be meant of our estate in general, (as I suppose it is) then this is indeed no distinct Justification, but only a confirming of the other. For in vain do we pretend to be justified by Faith, (by which alone *de Dieu* grants we are justified) so as through Christ to be freely acquitted from the guilt of our sins, if yet we remain unregenerate and unsanctified. By the way I observe, That *de Dieu*'s words are against you, [Jacobus *non agit de Justificatione, quæ partim fide, partim operibus peragatur*]. Thus much I had said in reference to this Author before I had him upon the Epistles; but now that I have him, I shall speak more fully to him, or to you of him, from that other place to which you remit me, *viz.* his Notes on *Rom.* 8. 4. There he speaks likewise of a Two-fold Righteousness, and of a Two-fold Justification, yet so as but little to patronize your Cause. Besides Imputed Righteousness, which we have in Christ, there is also (he saith, and who doth not?) an Inherent Righteousness which we have in our selves. The former Righteousness (he saith) is that, *Quâ nos Deus, etsi in nobis ipsis Legi adhuc difformes, plenè tamen, ipsius etiam Legis Testimonio, justificat, eique pro omninò conformibus habet in capite Christo: de quâ justificatione Apostolus supra*, cap. 3. & 4. & 5. *multis disputavit. Altera est, de quâ*, Rom. 6. 13. Ephes. 4. 24. 1 Joh. 3. 7. *Quâ nos Deus per regenerationem in nobis etiam ipsis Lege ex parte conformatos, ex parte nunc justificat, & indies justificat magis ac magis, prout incrementum capit regeneratio, ac justificabit plenè, ubi perfectio advenerit, de quâ Justificatione agitur*, Jac. 2. 21, 24. Apoc. 22. 11. Mat. 12. 37. 1 Reg. 8. 32. *Hanc justificationem Opera Legis ingrediuntur; ut primam constituit sola Fides*, i. e. *justitia Christi fide imputata, non opera; sic alteram constituunt opera, non fides.* Here, 1. he makes Inherent Righteousness imperfect, and so also the Justification which doth arise from it. By this Righteousness we are but *Legi ex parte conformati, &*

ex

ex parte nunc justificati: But Imputed Righteousness, and Justification by it, he acknowledgeth to be perfect: hereby we are *plenè justificati*; *tanquam Legi plenè conformes in capite Christo.* 2. He makes Faith only, *i. e.* (as he explains it) the Righteousness of Christ imputed by Faith, that whereby we are fully and perfectly justified. Now you make all Righteousness, as such, perfect: for otherwise you make it to be no Righteousness if it be imperfect. And you make Faith and Works to concur unto the same Justification, though you distinguish of the Inchoation, Continuation and Consummation of it. You also make Faith properly taken to be the Righteousness (though not the only Righteousness) by which we are justified. So that *de Dieu*'s Opinion and yours are much different.

Again, *Sola Fides* (*inquit*) *amplectens istam obedientiam* (*sc. Christi*) *imputatur in justitiam*, Ibid. *p.* 104.

And pag. 105. *Fidei imputatio est in justitiam perfectam, qualis est Obedientia Christi. Operum imputatio in imperfectam, qualia sunt ipsa Opera in hâc vitâ.*

And *pag.* 109. he cites *Bucer* in *Colloq. Ratisb.* as agreeing with him, and saying thus, *Dixeramus nos, secuti Apostolum, & omnem Scripturam, duplicem esse Sanctorum justitiam, quâ justi sunt coram Deo & hominibus. Unam Christi, perfectam, quâ illis spes omnis gratiæ Dei, & salutis vitaque sempiternæ tota nititur. Alteram in ipsis per Spiritum Christi inchoatum, quâ confidere non debent, propterea quòd ea imperfecta semper est, dum hîc vivunt, & Deo non nisi ex liberali & infinitâ ejus misericordiâ, & merito Christi probari non potest. Hâc justitia nemo justificatur coram Deo justificatione vitæ.---- Justitiam hanc Inchoatam sentimus esse quidem veram & vivam Justitiam, Dei præclarum & eximium donum, vitamque novam in Christo hâc justitiâ constare, omnesque Sanctos hac ipsâ quoque justitia justos esse, & coram Deo, & coram hominibus, & propter eam Sanctos quoque à Deo justificari justificatione Operum*, i. e. *comprobari eos à Deo, laudari, & remunerari. Attamen quamlibet hæc justitia sit vera ac viva, & suo etiam modo* (*N. B.*) *justificans, tamen non esse ejusmodi, non sic veram vivam & solidam, ut quisquam Sanctorum justificari ea possit justificatione*

vitæ, multo minus ut sit ipsa justitia vel justificatio vitæ.

Thus then *de Dieu* in the Matter it self doth not differ from other Protestant-Writers, who generally hold, That the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, is that by which we are fully and perfectly justified; and yet we must also have Inherent Righteousness, which will justifie us in some sort, but not fully and perfectly, because it self is imperfect.

For *Placeus* I have him not; but because you alledge his words, I will say something to him. He speaks indeed of a Two-fold Accusation, and of a Two-fold Justification. But, 1. he seems to differ from me and others only *modo loquendi*. For he saith, *Ab accusatione priore (qua sc. objicitur nos esse peccatores) sola fide justificamur; qua Christi gratiam & justitiam amplectimur: à posteriore, (qua objicitur nos esse infideles) justificamur etiam operibus, quatenus iis Fides (N. B.) ostenditur.* This seems to be in effect the same with that of *Maccovius*, *Conciliationem hîc (inter* Paulum & Jacobum) *hanc ponunt Theologi, & quidem ex Scriptura, sola Fides nos justificat apprehensivè, opera declarativè.* 2. To speak properly, they are not (I think) two distinct Accusations. For to omit this, That to be *Infideles*, is to be *Peccatores*; and so the one Accusation doth include the other: To omit this (I say) the latter Accusation is but a re-inforcing of the former. Thou art a Sinner, saith the Accuser, and therefore to be condemned. Not so, saith the Party accused, for I am a Believer, and therefore justified. Hereupon the Accuser replies, Nay, it is not so as thou pretendest, thou art indeed no Believer, therefore the guilt of thy sins is upon thee, and thou art under condemnation. All this is but one Accusation, prosecuted and confirmed against a Plea made against it. If they were distinct Accusations, then we might be freed from the one, and yet be condemned by the other: but it is here quite otherwise. For the force of the former Accusation doth depend upon the latter; neither are we freed from the former, except we be freed from the latter; whereas you seem to carry it so, as if we were first justified from the former Accusation, and then were again to be justified from the latter: this seems to be the result of your Opinion.

De Fide Justif. Disp. 12.

1. Be-

1. Because I grant Faith to be required of us, that so Christ's Righteousness may become ours, do I therefore make Faith it self to be our Righteousness, *viz.* that whereby we are fully justified. A part of Inherent Righteousness (I grant) Faith is, by which we may be justified in some measure; but that is not the Justification here enquired of. 2. You should not put me to prove, That your Assertion is without Scripture; it is sufficient for me to say it, until you alledge Scripture for it. 3. Christ's Satisfaction is solely and wholly our Righteousness, whereby we are justified from all Condemnation, though except we believe in him, we cannot enjoy that benefit by him; See 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult.* and *Acts* 13. 39. (*p.* 36.) 4. The New Covenant doth hold out unto us Christ's Righteousness to be made ours by Faith, that so we may be freed from the Condemnation of the Old Covenant, to which Condemnation we are left, if we believe not; and our Condemnation will be so much the sorer, by how much the sin in neglecting so great Salvation is the greater. 5. I confess indeed that there is more than Faith in the Condition of the New Covenant, but not as to Justification. For that which you add, [James *saith, We are justified by Works, and Christ by our Words*]; the question is not, Whether we be said to be justified by our Works or Words; but how and in what sense we are said to be so justified. There is a Particular Justification, and a Declarative Justification; thus we are justified by our Works and Words: but a full and formal Justification is only by Christ's Righteousness through Faith imputed unto us. 6. To say, That we are healed partly by the Medicine, and partly by the Application, I still think to be improper; neither do you bring any thing, whereby to shew the propriety of it. The Application of the Medicine is indeed requisite, yet it is the Medicine properly that doth heal, though not except there be an Application of it. Common Speech is not always Proper Speech; neither can any that are acquainted with Scripture, and know how to distinguish between Proper and Improper Speeches, think it strange that there are improper Speeches found in Scripture. What will you say of those, [*This is my Body*] [*The Rock was Christ*] and a hundred such-like? For Rules of Logick, if you had made use of any, I might have considered of them. 7. May 30.

not a Similitude illuſtrate, though there be ſuch a difference as you ſpeak of, betwixt that from which it is fetched, and that to which it is applied? But why do you joyn Repentance and Obedience with Faith in point of Juſtification; I ſpeaking only of Faith, and you as yet having ſaid nothing for the joint intereſt of the other? 8. In your *Aphoriſms* you plainly aſſert two diſtinct Righteouſneſſes, as requiſite unto Juſtification; that there you make them ſubordinate, is more than I obſerve. But though Faith be ſubordinate unto Chriſt's Satisfaction in the matter of Juſtification, yet that we are juſtified by Faith as a diſtinct Righteouſneſs, I cannot yeeld, no more than that the Application of a Medicine is a diſtinct Medicine by which one is healed. I am glad that you plainly diſclaim a Coordination of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs and Faith in the Work of Juſtification: But if they be but ſubordinate, then (me-thinks) they ſhould not be two diſtinct Righteouſneſſes, by which we are juſtified. I ſee not how we can be juſtified (I ſpeak of an Univerſal Juſtification, oppoſite to all condemnation, that which *Bucer* calls *Juſtificationem Vitæ*) both by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us, and alſo by our own perſonal Righteouſneſs. You ſay, [*A Man having a Medicine, and not applying it, may properly be ſaid to die for want of Application*]; but to ſpeak properly, I think, It is not the want of Application of the Medicine, but the Diſeaſe that doth kill the Man; So though a Man wanting Faith ſhall be condemned, yet take Faith meerly as a Condition, not as a Duty, it is not properly the want of Faith, but Sin that is the cauſe of his Condemnation; though his want of Faith may as aggravate his Sin, ſo increaſe his Condemnation.

Apud. Lud. de Dieu in *Rom.* 8. 4.

Ibid. 20. 108.

That I ſpeak your words, is more than I do know. How Chriſt's Righteouſneſs may be called our Legal Righteouſneſs, I ſhewed by *Rom.* 10. 4. viz. as ſerving us inſtead of that Righteouſneſs which the Law required of us, and for want of which the Law otherwiſe would (*p.* 36.) have condemned us. Neither did I blame you meerly for calling Chriſt's Satisfaction our Legal Righteouſneſs, but for making another Righteouſneſs of our own, which you call our Evangelical Righteouſneſs, neceſſary unto Juſtification. Now alſo you overlook that, which I alledged about Chriſt's Satisfaction, as being our Evangelical Righteouſneſs. 1. Doth

2. Doth the Old Covenant prescribe Christ's Satisfaction as our Righteousness? You said a little before, [*I do not think, that Christ's Righteousness of Satisfaction is that which the Law required*]; as if I said, That the Law did require it; whereas I meant only this, That the Law required Satisfaction, and Christ made it for us, so that Christ's Satisfaction serveth us instead of that Righteousness which the Law required of us, and so may be called our Legal Righteousness. But the New Covenant doth hold out Christ's Righteousness to be apprehended by us, and made ours by Faith, that so thereby we may be justified. Where the Scripture speaks of a Two-fold Righteousness so as you do, or how this makes for the unfolding of the main Doctrine, or tends to heal our Breaches, I do not see: You affirm these things, but do not prove them. 2. What plain ground you laid down in your *Aphorisms* for that Two-fold Righteousness, I do not know: What I could observe any way Argumentative, I was willing to examine, and so am still. *Ibid.* *Ib.* 110.

1. If it imply Blasphemy, to say, That Christ repented, and believed for us; Doth it follow that Faith or Repentance is our Righteousness, by which we are justified? Can nothing be required of us, and performed by us, but it must therefore be our Righteousness, and by it as our Righteousness we must be justified? 2. The Scriptures which I alledged, (viz. *Rom.* 9. 29. & 10. 6. *Gal.* 5. 5. and *Rom.* 3. 22.) do sufficiently distinguish Faith from that Righteousness, whereby we are justified, and shew it to be only a means, whereby we partake of Christ's Righteousness, and so by that Righteousness of Christ are justified. The Argument (I think) is good, notwithstanding any thing you say unto it. Faith is only a means whereby Christ's Righteousness is imputed unto us unto Justification: Therefore it is not that Righteousness by which we are justified, *Rivet* speaking of the Remonstrants saith, *Volunt igitur Fidem cum operibus venire in partem justitiæ debitæ, & Fidem justificare, non Relativè, ut organum apprehendens objectum, sed Inhærenter*, &c. *Hoc iniquitatis mysterium*, &c. 31. 21. 111. *De Fide Justif.* §. 15. & 16

1. You might easily know what I meant by [Simply and Absolutely justified in the sight of God], if you did well consider the other Members of the distinction, *viz.* to be wholly freed from all Condemnation; the same *Ibid.*

that Mr. *Bradshaw* meant by Universal Justification: You know sufficiently the distinction betwixt *Simpliciter* or *Absolutè*, & *secundum quid*. *Bradshaw* having said, *Hoc modo* (*sc. justificatione particulari*) *non Electi soli, sed & Reprobi ipsi coram Deo Justificari possunt*: Adds immediately, *Neutri vero eorum absolute hoc modo justificari possunt.* ---- *Hoc modo justificari non est penitus à peccati reatu, sed ab hujus vel illius peccati imputatione injustâ liberari.* 2. Comparative Righteousness I shewed to be but a less degree of Unrighteousness: but Ironical Righteousness is down-right Unrighteousness, whereas a less Unrighteousness in comparison of a greater, is a kind of Righteousness. *Minus malum respectu majoris habet rationem boni.* 3. I do not deny the Righteousness of Faith, though I deny Faith to be that Righteousness by which we are justified. Though our Salvation depend upon our Faith, and sincere Obedience, yet are we not therefore justified by Obedience, but *Declarativè*, as it is the fruit of Justifying Faith; nor by Faith, but *Apprehensivè*, as by it we apprehend and receive Christ's Righteousness.

Ibid. & 32. 1. I never doubted much less denied Faith to be a part of Inherent Righteousness. 2. It is indeed a strange Righteousness, that will not justifie so far forth as it will reach: but it is not strange to Protestant-Divines, that Inherent Righteousness cannot reach so far as to justifie in that sense as we speak of Justification. *Illud concedimus*, (*inquit* Daven.) *esse in omnibus justificatis justitiam quandam inherentem, quam si formalem causam statuant Justificationis*, (*liceat enim vocabulum procudere*) *non repugnabimus: sed predicta Justificationis, quæ respondet stricto examini Cœlestis Judicis, nec formalis, nec meritoria esse ullo modo potest.* And he lays down these two Positions; *De Justif. Habit. cap. 22.*

Ibid. 1. *Christi Mediatoris, in nobis habitantis, atque per Spiritum sese nobis unientis, perfectissima Obedientia, est formalis causa justificationis Nostræ, utpote quæ ex donatione Dei, & applicatione Fidei fit nostra.* 2. *Justitia per Spiritum Christi nobis impressa & inherens, non est formalis causa, per quam stamus justificati, hoc est, per quam liberari judicamur à damnatione, & acceptati ad vitam æternam, tanquam eâdem digni per hanc qualitatem nobis inherentem.* That you may not catch at the word [*digni*], he afterward expresseth it thus; *Atque hic ne inanem de vocabulis*

Ibid. *cap. 26.*

cabulis velitationem inſtituamus, illud præmittendum nos per formalem cauſam Juſtificationis nihil aliud intelligere, quam illud, per quod ſtamus in conſpectu Dei à damnatione liberati, innocentes, gratificati, & ad vitam æternam acceptati. And the whole Chapter is to prove that *Inhærens Juſtitia non eſt formalis cauſa Juſtificationis Noſtræ coram Deo.* But it is a needleſs labour to cite Authors to this purpoſe. For what more common with our Divines (I ſpeak of ſuch as are of chief note) than to acknowledg Inherent Righteouſneſs, and yet to deny that we are juſtified by it? What you mean, when you yeeld that we are not univerſally juſtified by Faith, I do not well underſtand. For if you mean (as you ſeem to do) that we are not freed by it from the Puniſhment of the Old Covenant, but only from the Puniſhment of the New Covenant; 1. I know no Puniſhment of the New Covenant, but a leaving to the Puniſhment of the Old Covenant, with an aggravation of it for contempt of Mercy offered. 2. Faith, though not as our Righteouſneſs, yet as the means whereby we partake of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, doth free us from the Puniſhment of the Old Covenant, *viz.* Death. For *the Juſt ſhall live by Faith*, Rom. 1. 17. And in that ſenſe Faith doth univerſally juſtifie us. For *being juſtified by Faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, Rom. 5. 1. Whereas you ſpeak of juſtifying againſt the Accuſation of Non-performing the Condition of the New Covenant; I muſt ſtill tell you, That taking the Condition meerly as a Condition, the Accuſation of non-performing it, is but a confirming a former Accuſation of being guilty of the breach of the Old Covenant, and therefore to be condemned, as having no relief from the New Covenant, the Condition of it being not performed. 3. If I do ill oppoſe the Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, and the Righteouſneſs whereby we are ſanctified, as if the ſame thing might not be both; then welfare the Papiſts, who confound Juſtification and Sanctification. *Durans* the Jeſuite, in his Defence of *Campian*, ſaith, *Nova hæc*, Whitakere, *Theologia eſt, nos per gratiam infuſam, vitæ novitatem ac ſanctificationem adipiſci, minimè tamen juſtificari. At quæ te, obſecro, Scriptura docuit Juſtificationem à Sanctificatione diſtinguere?* The ſame Righteouſneſs

Duræus Adverſ. Whitak.

that

that doth ſanctifie, cannot alſo juſtifie; becauſe that Righteouſneſs, which doth ſanctifie, doth it but in part; but that which doth juſtifie, muſt do it fully, or elſe it is to little purpoſe. For (as *Bradſhaw* obſerves) *even the Reprobate as well as others, may have a particular Juſtification.* 4. The Texts which I cited, (*Luk.* 1. 75. *Epheſ.* 4. 24. *Pſal.* 147. 17. *Apoc.* 22. 11.) ſeem to me to make the terms [*Righteouſneſs and Holineſs, Righteous and Holy*] *equipollent:* and that Text, *Pſal.* 145. 17. ſpeaks not of God's People, but of God himſelf, which (it ſeems) you did not obſerve. And why ſhould you call it *tautologizing*, when two words are joined together as Synonima's? What is more frequent in Scripture than this? It hath more ſhew of tautology, when divers ſentences importing the ſame thing, are joyned together; which yet is very uſual. And as the Scriptures, ſo alſo our Divines do promiſcuouſly uſe the words [Righteouſneſs] and [Holineſs]. *Davenant, Hanc ergò qualitatem juſtitiæ, ſive Sanctitatis, quam Deus imprimit hominibus renatis, negamus eſſe cauſam formalem juſtificationis,* &c. So *Ames. Non excluditur juſtitia, ſeu Sanctitas inherens,* &c. 5. The Matter of our Righteouſneſs, is that which is conformable to the Law: *Juſtum eſt, quod eſt ſecundum Legem; Injuſtum, quod contra Legem*; and ſo by your own confeſſion is the matter of our Holineſs.

De Juſtif. cap. 25. *De Juſt. Habit.* cap. 26. *Bell. Ener.* Tom. 4. l. 6. c. 1. p. 126.

32. 1. They are no vulgar Divines, that ſay, Our Inherent Righteouſneſs is imperfect; yea, and make this one principal Argument to prove that we are not juſtified by Inherent Righteouſneſs. *Fides, & ſpes, & Charitas* (*inquit* Whitakerus) *nos juſtos aliquo modo faciunt, ſed inchoatè, non abſolute. Lud. de Dieu,* and in him *Bucer* were cited before. Hear now *Davenant*; *Ipſa* (*inquit*) *juſtitia inherens, in ſe conſiderata, qualis reperitur in viatoribus, imperfecta eſt, atque caret illis perfectionis gradibus, qui ad juſtificationem perfectam neceſſario requiruntur. Vide etiam* Ibid. cap. 23. *ad Arg.* 6. Thus alſo *Ameſius*; *Juſtitia quâ juſtificatur homo coram Deo, debet eſſe perfecta: Sed juſtitia nobis inhærens, non eſt talis. Ergo.* *Worton* ſpeaks not only for himſelf, but alſo for others, even our chiefeſt Divines; *Lutherus, Melanchthon, Calvinus, & Chemnitius, ea potiſſimum cauſâ* (*N. B.*) *nos infuſâ & inhærente juſtitiâ*

Contra Camp. ad Rat. 8. p. 178. *De Juſtif. Habit.* cap. 26. Arg. 4. *Contra Bellar.* Tom. 4. lib. 6. c. 1. Arg. 11. *De Recon.* par. 2. l. 1. c. 19.

stitiâ justificari non posse contendunt, quòd illa in nobis ita imperfecta sit, ut in Dei conspectum, cum ad judicandum accedat, prodire non audeat.

And again; *Nihil profectò causæ erat, cur Vasquez in* 1. 2. *Disp.* 202. *n.* 26. *tantopere huic argumento consideret, ut illo potissimum niteretur; Perfectio nostra justitia* (*inquit* Vasques) *non debet probari ex quibusdam Scripturæ testimoniis, in quibus commendatur perfecta & integra charitas, sed potiùs ex illis, in quibus docemur nobis inesse justitiam. Nam justitia non est, quæ vera, & perfecta non est.* *Ibid.* cap. 23.

And again; *Justitia nostra habitualis nobis à Deo infusa, non est perfecta.* And again; *Respondent nostri Theologi justitiam illam habitualem esse imperfectam.* I will add one more, whom both you and I reverence, *viz.* Mr. *Blake*, He having spoken of some (he names none, but you know, I suppose, whom he meaneth) who grant Holiness to be imperfect, but will have Righteousness (our Personal Righteousness) by all means to be perfect; he adds, [This and much more to assert a personal perfect Inherent Righteousness, as is said] all which, as it is here held out, to me is new, and I must confess my self in ignorance all over. I never take Imperfect Righteousness to imply any such contradiction, no more than Imperfect Holiness. *Isaiah* (I am sure) saith, *All our Righteousnesses are as filthy Rags*, &c. See more afterward. *Ibid.* lib. 2. c. 16. & c. 19. Of the Covenant, *ch.* 16. *p.* 10

2. I take Righteousness to be a Conformity to the Law, which Conformity may be more or less perfect, as one may more or less come up to the Rule set before him. If I over-slipt any thing in your *Aphorisms*, you might have directed me to it; otherwise to search for it, may prove both a tedious and a fruitless labour.

That one thing may be more or less like another, is most evident, so that if all the wit in the World should conspire against it, yet one might as easily demonstrate it, as he did, who to prove *dari motum*, when one had disputed against it, rose up and walked. Is not the Similitude sometime more, sometime less, that is betwixt Parents and Children, and betwixt Children of the same Parents, especially Twinns? and so in other things? To deny this, what is it but to put out mens eyes, or to bid defiance unto common-sense? *Relata recipiunt magis & minus,* *Ibid.* *Alio alio amicior, & similior,* Alsted. *Metaph. lib.* 2. *c.* 5. *Log.* l. 1. c. 7

minus, ſaith *Burgerſdicius*. Yet he ſaith, *Recipere magis & minus non convenit omnibus Relatis.* Surely there is great difference betwixt *Similitudo* and *Æqualitas*, ſo that neither *Scheibler* nor any Man elſe muſt think to carry it ſo, as if there were *eadem utriuſque ratio*; ſo that becauſe *Æqualitas conſiſtit in indiviſibili*; therefore *ſimilitudo* muſt do ſo too. Perfect Righteouſneſs indeed is *quadam Æqualitas*, not ſimply all Righteouſneſs. That an Action cannot be conform to the Precept, except it be perfectly conform, you muſt prove as well as aſſert, before I can aſſent. I could yet ſee no reaſon to doubt of that which Mr. *Blake* ſaith, [*As an Image carrying an imperfect reſemblance of its Samplar, is an Image; ſo Conformity imperfectly anſwering to the Rule, is Conformity likewiſe*].

Of the Coven. c. 16. p. 111

33. 1. You do not well to confound Conformity and Equality. And though the Law require perfect Conformity, which none can perform, it doth not follow that imperfect Conformity is none at all. If a perfect Conformity to the Law could be performed by us, then we ſhould be juſtified by the Law, which we cannot be: yet the Regenerate conform to the Law in ſome meaſure, and ſo it behoves us to do; For *then ſhall I not be aſhamed, when I have reſpect to all thy Commandments*, Pſ. 119. 6. I let paſs your Second and Third. Ad 4. I do not ſpeak of Qualification conſidered abſolutely, but in reference to the Rule. Mr. *Blake* ſaith well, [*Neither do I underſtand how Holineſs ſhould be imperfect, taken materially, and Righteouſneſs perfect, taken formally, in reference to a Rule. We may (for ought I know) as well make Holineſs formal, and refer it to a Rule, and Righteouſneſs material, in an abſolute conſideration, without reference to any Rule at all. And in ſuch conſideration I do not know how there can be perfection or imperfection either in Holineſs or Righteouſneſs; it is as they come up, or fall ſhort of the Rule, that they have the denomination of perfection or imperfection*]. Holineſs and Righteouſneſs are oppoſite unto ſin: therefore formally conſidered, they are a Conformity to the Rule, as Sin is a deviation from it. The Conformity therefore of our Actions and Diſpoſitions to the Rule is not (as you ſay) the matter of our Righteouſneſs, but (as I conceive) it is the form; and our Actions and Diſpoſitions

Loc. cit.

ons themſelves are the matter of it, *viz.* of our Perſonal and Inherent Righteouſneſs; and ſo of our Holineſs. The Rule of Righteouſneſs (to which as we conform more or leſs, we are more or leſs righteous) is the Law, the ſum whereof is contained in the Decalogue: therefore it is ſaid, That Believers are under the Law as a Rule, though not under it as a Covenant. For *Pœna Evangelica*, of which you ſpeak, I have ſaid enough of it before.

To your Queries and Objections, I anſwer, Ad 1. Chriſt doth juſtifie the Unrighteous, God doth juſtifie the Ungodly, *Rom.* 4. 5. But how? They were unrighteous and ungodly before they were juſtified; they are not ſo when they are juſtified, though it is not their Perſonal Righteouſneſs or Godlineſs whereby they are juſtified. *Know ye not that the Unrighteous ſhall not inherit*, &c. *And ſuch were ſome of you, but you are waſhed*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10, 11. That of *Tarnovius*, cited by Mr. *Ball*, is uſeful here; *In Scriptura ſæpe res dicitur quod paulò antè fuit, ut cæci vident, ſurdi audiunt, claudi ambulant*, &c. Ad 2. The Law doth not juſtifie any but ſuch as are perfectly righteous; therefore they that are imperfectly, though truly righteous, cannot be juſtified by it. *Sumus verè juſti*, (ſaith *Davenant*) *non putativè, ſi reſpiciamus juſtitiam noſtram habitualem: ſed hæc vera juſtitia eſt adhuc inchoata & imperfecta.* And again, *Sanctificationem noſtram non putativam & fictitiam, ſed veram & realem ſtatuimus.* Bellarmini *autem Dialecticam, qui inde concludit nos juſtificari juſtitiâ inherente, putativam arbitramur, & fictitiam.* And why ſhould not Imperfect Righteouſneſs be acknowledged True Righteouſneſs, as well as Imperfect Holineſs is acknowledged True Holineſs? That of the Apoſtle, *Epheſ.* 4. 24. [*in Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs*]; or, as the Original hath it, [*in righteouſneſs and holineſs of Truth*], attributes Truth as well to Righteouſneſs, (though imperfect) as to Holineſs. *Genitivus Veritatis* (ſaith *Calvin* on the place) *loco Epithetî poſitus eſt, qui tam juſtitiæ, quam ſanctitati convenit.* Ad 3. You ſeem quite to miſtake the meaning of that in *James* 2. 10. It makes nothing againſt an Imperfect Righteouſneſs, but only ſhews, That reſpect muſt be had to one Precept as well as to another be-

Ibid. & 34.

Of the Coven. p. 219.

De Juſt. Hab. c. 23. ad Arg. 7.

Ibid. ad Arg. 8.

cauſe

cause though a Man should keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, *viz.* so as wholly to wave it, and to have no respect unto it, he were guilty of all, his Obedience were indeed none at all. For to obey, is to do that which is commanded, because it is commanded. Now he that doth any one thing *eo nomine* because it is commanded, will indeavour to do every thing that is commanded. *A Quatenus ad omne*, &c. That this is the meaning of the words, is clear by v. 11. See *Calvin* on the place. Ad 4. The Law doth pronounce an imperfect Obeyer imperfectly righteous; and therefore if he be left to the Law, to stand or fall by it, he shall not be justified for his Righteousness, but shall be condemned for his Imperfection. Ad 5. The Damned and Devils cannot be pronounced Righteous according to the Law, as the Saints may. Is there no difference betwixt Imperfect Obedience, and Perfect (if it may be called Perfect) Disobedience? The Unregenerate do something that, but nothing as the Law requireth: the Regenerate do something both that, and as, though not so perfectly as the Law requireth. *Licet modus agendi* (*inquit* Daven.) *bonus sit, quia agunt ex fide & charitate, tamen gradus in hoc modo deficit, quia non agunt ex tantâ fide & charitate quanta ab ipsâ Lege præcipitur.* It is granted, That the best action of any upon earth is not good and just according to the rigour of the Law; for the rigour of the Law requires it to be perfectly good and just, which it is not. But it follows not, that therefore it is not good and just at all. *Nam aliud est* (saith the same learned Author) *actionem esse verè bonam, aliud esse purè bonam, & ab omni vitio liberam: sicut aliud est aurum verum, aliud aurum purum, ab omni fœce depuratum.* That Rule therefore, *Bonum non nisi ex integrâ causâ oritur, malum ex quolibet defectu*, must be taken *cum grano salis*, *viz.* so as that the *Defectus* must be either in the substance of the Act, or in some material Circumstance: And of such Actions Dr. *Twisse* (whom you cite) doth speak; *Qui dat eleemosynam vanæ gloriæ studio*, &c. There is indeed some defect in the best Actions of the best Men, *quoad gradum*: But shall we therefore deny them to be good, because they are some way defective, and so not perfectly good? And see here I pray, to what you have now brought the matter; even to make Imperfect Holiness

De Just. Act. c. 34. *Memb.* 2.

Ibid. Cap. 36. *ad test.* 7.

Holineſs no Holineſs, as well as Imperfect Righteouſneſs no Righteouſneſs. For is not Holineſs Goodneſs as well as Righteouſneſs? Therefore if every defect make Goodneſs no Goodneſs, then there is no more an Imperfect Holineſs (which yet you grant) then there is an Imperfect Righteouſneſs. Thoſe words, [*Neque putandum eſt, fieri poſſe, ut per Legem ſaltem aliquâ ex parte juſtificemur*] taken in *rigore* are not true. For then there were no ſuch thing as a particular Juſtification; neither do they accord with that which I cited before out of *Lud. de Dieu* on *Rom.* 8: 4. to which place you did refer me. Indeed we cannot be ſo juſtified by the Law, as thereby to be freed from all condemnation; and this ſeems to be all that your Author here cited did mean, when he ſaith, *Si non es Legem tranſgreſſus, Lege juſtificaris: ſi tranſgreſſus es, condemnaris.* But this doth no more prove, That Righteouſneſs muſt either be perfect, or it is none at all, (though indeed it is none as to abſolute and univerſal Juſtification) than it doth prove, that there is no Holineſs at all, except it be perfect. For doth not the Law require perfect Holineſs as well as perfect Righteouſneſs? And is not every tranſgreſſion of the Law a privation of Holineſs, as well as of Righteouſneſs? How then can you admit an Imperfect Holineſs to be Holineſs, and yet deny an Imperfect Righteouſneſs to be Righteouſneſs? And if our Inherent Righteouſneſs (for of that we ſpeak) muſt needs be perfect, if it be any at all, muſt not the ſame be ſaid of our Holineſs, this being a conformity to the Law as well as the other?

1. You do not anſwer my Queſtion, *viz.* Whether thoſe Orthodox Writers (a multitude of whom you ſay you could heap up) do make our Perſonal Righteouſneſs that by which we are juſtified. If they do not, their calling it Evangelical is to no purpoſe. 2. It is not prepoſterous to ſay, That Righteouſneſs (*viz.* inherent) is required unto Sanctification; it being that whereby we are ſanctified, as Imputed Righteouſneſs is that whereby we are juſtified. You ſaid before, That I did ill oppoſe that whereby we are juſtified, as if the ſame thing might not do both: You grant then (it ſeems) that Righteouſneſs may ſanctifie; I think it muſt, and ſo is required unto Sanctification. How you can make Inherent Righteouſneſs *ita ſe habere ad ſanctificationem, ut ſe habet* 34.

Albeda

Albedo ad Parietem, to me seems very strange: rather (I think) *ut se habet Albedo ad Dealbationem*. 3. If you had spoken absolutely without any qualification, [*He that affirmeth a Man Righteous*, (viz. *by Inherent Righteousness*) *and yet denieth him to be justified*, viz. *by that Righteousness, contradicteth himself*] you had condemned all our famous Divines (I think) of self-contradiction. But your speech being so qualified, as it is, [*so far as he is Righteous*] I know not at whom it striketh. But though none by the Law of Works can be pronounced perfectly righteous, and therefore if they be tryed by it, all will be found unrighteous, yet doth it not therefore follow, that there is no such thing as an Imperfect Righteousness.

Ibid. You seem not to dislike what I say, neither do I what you now say. I grant, that the New Covenant is to the wicked an unspeakable mercy, in that by it they may be freed from the condemnation of the Old Covenant: yet until they embrace the New Covenant, they remain under the Old, even under the condemnation of it.

35. 1. Concerning Christ's Satisfaction, how it may be called both our Legal and our Evangelical Righteousness, I have spoken before. Legal Righteousness may either signifie the Righteousness of the Law, τῦ νόμυ, or the Righteousness which is of or from the Law, ἐκ τῦ νόμυ. There is great difference between these two, for the former is asserted, but the latter is exploded, *Rom.* 8. 4. & 10. 5. *Phil.* 3. 9. Christ's Satisfaction may be called our Legal Righteousness in the former sense, not the latter. But in both respects it is our Evangelical Righteousness, as being the Righteousness of the Gospel, τῦ εὐαγγελίυ, *i. e.* the Righteousness which the Gospel doth hold out unto us, and the Righteousness which is of or from the Gospel, ἐκ τῦ εὐαγγελίυ, *i. e.* the Righteousness which by the Gospel we are made partakers of through Faith. And therefore it is called the Righteousness which is of Faith, ἐκ πίστεως, and by Faith, διὰ πίστεως, *Rom.* 9. 30. & 10. 6. *Phil.* 3. 9. 2. In that Faith is the Condition, or Instrument (or what any please to call it) whereby Christ's Righteousness is made ours unto Justification, it rather follows, that Faith it self is not properly our Righteousness, by which we are justified.

Some-

Something out of *Rivet* I have cited before to this purpose; hear also what another saith, *viz. Vignerius*, whose Disputation *Rivet* much commends, and thought meet to annex it to his own, *Quidni in fide nostrâ gloriabimur, si ex fide justificatio est, ut opera Evangelico, & appositâ fœderis conditione, contra Apostolum, qui existi inter excluſam esse dicit per Legem fidei gloriationem?* Rom. 3. 26. --- *An possibile est, ut sit fidei instrumentum accipiendæ justitiæ, & simul sit ipsa, quam quærimus, justitia? Utut sanè glorietur homo, solus tamen Christus est nostra justitia, nec aliud agit Fides, quam quòd Christum apprehendit, & nostram facit illius justitiam, ut in eo inveniamur, non nostram habentes justitiam, quæ ex Lege est, sed illam, quæ est per fidem Christi, justitiam, quæ est ex Deo per fidem*, Phil. 3. 9.

De Satisfact. Christi, opera Riveti, *Disp.* 13 §. 61.

1. I see nothing in the place cited (*viz. Aphor.* p. 127, 128.) but a Similitude, which proves nothing; and I gave some touch of it in the *Animadversions*. Whereas you now say, [*In respect of the condition of our personal performance to make Christ's Satisfaction ours, Faith is imputed unto us instead of our personal performance of Perfect Obedience*], it seems to imply as if personal performance of Perfect Obedience might be required as a Condition to make Christ's Satisfaction ours, which were very strange. For if Perfect Obedience could be performed by us, what need were there of Christ's Satisfaction to be imputed to us, except for sin committed or contracted before this personal performance of perfect Obedience? *If Righteousness come by the Law, Christ died in vain*, Gal. 2. *ult.* But how-ever, such Obedience cannot be performed by any, there being *not a Just man upon Earth, that doth good, and sinneth not*, Eccles. 7. 20. That Faith is as effectual or sufficient a Condition under the New Covenant, as perfect personal Obedience, if performed, would have been under the Old Covenant: if this were all that you meant, though I like not your expression, yet I allow the thing; only this I think meet to observe, That perfect personal Obedience was so the Condition of the Old Covenant, that it was also the Righteousness required in it: But Faith is so the Condition of the New Covenant, as that it is not properly the Righteousness it self, but only a means to partake of Christ's Satisfaction, which is the Righteousness that the

Ibid.

New Covenant doth offer and afford to a Believer, instead of Perfect Obedience personally to be performed by the Old Covenant. For that which you add about the paying of a Pepper-Corn, &c. I do not think that we can be said truly and properly to pay any thing our selves as a price, whereby to purchase the benefits of the New Covenant; see *Isa.* 55. 1. and *Apoc.* 22. 17. When we preach and press Holiness and Good Works, we use to distinguish betwixt *Via Regni & Causa regnandi*; and we make them requisite unto Glorification, but not unto Justification. *Dicimus* (*inquit* Rivetus) *bona opera necessaria esse, tanquam adjunctum consequens justificationem, tanquam effectum acquisita salutis, quatenus salus accipitur pro justificatione; & tanquam antecedens ad salutem, quatenus accipitur pro glorificatione; non autem tanquam causam, qua salutem efficiat.*

Colleg. Controver. Disp. 36.

2. The acceptance of a Gift, being a means to enjoy it, is a means whereby the Gift doth inrich; and so Faith is a means whereby Christ's Righteousness doth justifie us, as being a means whereby it is imputed unto us, and made ours. But properly it is the Gift that doth inrich, though not without the acceptance of it; and so it is the Righteousness of Christ that doth justifie, though not without Faith. The Tryal of a Man's Title in Law to a Gift, depends on the Tryal, and Proof of his Acceptance of it, because otherwise except he accept of the Gift, it is none of his: Yet for all this, it is the Gift that doth inrich, though it must be accepted, that it may do it. And so it is Christ's Righteousness that we are justified by, though Faith be required of us, that it may be made ours, and so we may be justified by it.

36. That my words are contradictory one to another, you say, but the Reason which you add for proof of it, is of little force. I deny it to be as proper to say, [*We are justified by Faith as a Condition*] as to say, [*We are justified by Christ's Satisfaction, as the Meritorious Cause*]; yea and as the Righteousness by which we are justified. What inconvenience doth arise from it, if *Paul* and the Scriptures do oftner speak improperly than properly in this Point? May not improper Speeches, concerning some Point, be more frequent in Scripture, than proper? Sacramental Speeches, wherein the Sign is called by the name of the Thing signified, are improper: Yet are they more

more frequent in Scripture, than those which in that kind are more proper.

1. You not clearing the Question, either there or any where else (that I know) in your *Aphorisms*, seemed to leave it doubtful; and so I thought meet to note it, that you might prevent any ones stumbling at it. *Ibid.*

2. What you now add upon review, doth less please; For the Holiness that is in us, is from God, the imperfection of it is from our selves; this therefore may be sinful, though God's Work be good.

3. Relation when it is founded in Quality, may (for any thing I see) be intended and remitted, as the Quality is wherein it is founded. I like not *Scheiblers* joyning Similitude and Equality together, as if there were the same reason of both. One thing cannot be more or less equal, though it may be nearer to, or further from Equality than another; but one thing may be more or less like, when yet there is a true and proper likeness in both. *Ibid.* *Vide Alsted. Metaphys.* lib. 2. c. 5.

2. That no Man ever performeth one act fully and exactly conform to the Law of Works, is the same that I say: But why do you put in these terms [*fully and exactly*] if there can be no conformity but that which is full and exact?

3. That our Inherent Righteousness (for I must still mind you that we are speaking of it) is *Non-ratum pars*, I deny; and all that you add there in that Page is impertinent, as being nothing to Inherent Righteousness, about which now is all the Dispute. *Pag.* 37. You seem to come up to what I say, when you grant, that our Gospel-Righteousness considered *in esse officii*, as related to, or measured by the Precept, so our Faith and Holiness admit of degrees. Here by Faith and Holiness, you mean the same with that which immediately before you called Gospel-Righteousness, which must needs be meant of Inherent Righteousness. As for those words which you insert, [and that only *quoad materiam praecepti*] I know not well what they mean. For how can *officium*, as related to, and measured by the Precept, be considered but *quoad materiam praeceptam?*

1. If I take Holiness (as you say) as opposite to Sin. How do I make all the Actions of the Heathens Holy? Do I make them not sinful? I have ever approved of those Sayings of the Ancients. 37.

Prosp. de Vocat. Gent. lib. 1. cap. 7. Idem in Sentent. ex Aug. Sent. 106. Aug. contra Julian. lib. 4. c. 3.

Sine cultu veri Dei, etiam quod virtus videtur esse, peccatum est. And, *Omnis infidelium vita, peccatum est, & nihil est bonum sine summo bono. Ubi enim defuit agnitio æternæ & incommutabilis veritatis, falsa virtus est, etiam in optimis moribus.* And, *Quicquid boni fit ab homine, & non propter hoc fit, propter quod fieri debere vera sapientia præcepit, & se officio videatur bonum, ipso non recte fine peccatum est.* Scripture also doth carry me that way, namely these places, *Rom.* 8. 8, 9. and *Heb.* 11. 6. I wave that place *Rom.* 14. *ult.* because it seems to look another way; though *Prosper de Vitâ Contempl. lib. 3. cap.* 1. doth urge it to this purpose. There is not then the same reason of the Actions of Heathens, as of the Actions of Believers: these are imperfectly holy, the other are altogether unholy.

2. You grant that Holiness is the same with Righteousness, which is opposed to *Reatus Culpæ*: And truly I should think, that Inherent Righteousness is rather *Non-reatus Culpæ*, than *Non-reatus Pœnæ*. For your Parenthesis, [*If any were found, that had any such Righteousness according to the Law of Works*] it is ever granted, That such a perfect Righteousness is not found in any upon Earth; but still it is denyed, that because it is not perfect, therefore it is none at all.

Ad Ctesiphont. contra Pelagian.

Justi appellantur (saith *Hierom*, speaking of *Zachary, Elizabeth, Job*, &c.) *non quòd omni vitio careant, sed quòd majori parte virtutum comprehendantur.* You grant, that Holiness may be denominated from its congruency to the Precept as a Precept. Now this you must grant, may *recipere magis & minus*: for so you grant that Holiness may. And if Congruency, why not Conformity? For Congruency and Conformity, though divers words, yet import (for any thing I see) one and the same thing: I take Faith to be in part our Inherent Righteousness, as it is *Officium*, not as it is *Conditio præcisè considerata*.

3. Whether Habitual Faith, or Actual, be properly the Condition of the Covenant, is little to our purpose. And for the thing it self, as I shall grant, that we must not content our selves with a habit of Faith, but must also act Faith: So (I think) you will not deny, that we are *Fideles*, and so justified, even when we sleep, though no act of Faith be performed by us.

You

You ſay nothing to that which I anſwered concerning our Divines, of whom you ſpake, *viz.* That they hold, That the Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, is not our Perſonal Righteouſneſs; and therefore though they ſay, (as you alledge) That our Juſtification is perfect, and therefore (as you infer) our Righteouſneſs, *viz.* whereby we are juſtified, muſt be perfect alſo; yet all this is little to your purpoſe. *Ibid.*

2. To what you ſay, I have ſaid enough before, *viz.* That Faith which is the Condition of the New Covenant, as to Juſtification, is not our Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, but only a means to partake of Chriſt's Satisfaction, the only Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified. And for being *rei pœnæ Novæ Legis* for non-performance of its Condition; I ſay ſtill, I know no puniſhment of the New Law for want of Faith as its Condition, but only a leaving to the puniſhment of the Old Law; which puniſhment yet (I grant) will be ſo much the more grievous, as the ſin, which an Unbeliever, both as an Unbeliever, and otherwiſe, is guilty of by Goſpel-Aggravations, is the more hainous.

1. Is little doubt but that ſincerity of Righteouſneſs doth conſiſt with imperfection of Righteouſneſs, *viz.* Inherent Righteouſneſs, which is really the ſame with Holineſs, how-ever in this or that reſpect we may diſtinguiſh the one from the other. 38.

2. How Hypocriſie can be taken for a ſeeming or appearing better than we are, yet without affectation or diſſimulation, I do not underſtand. If without any affectation or diſſimulation of ours, we ſeem better than we are, it is another's errour, not our fault; neither can we therefore be called Hypocrites. Your manifold diſtinctions of Sincerity do ſerve rather to confound the Reader, than to unfold the matter. I take ſincerity to be no diſtinct Grace, but the *Modus* of other Graces: but why that *Modus* may not admit of degrees, I confeſs I do not ſee. I conceive Zeal to be of like nature, yet one may be more or leſs zealous, and ſo alſo more or leſs ſincere. You ſay here, [There is no *Medium inter Ens & non Ens*] of which I make no doubt but *pag.* 2. you think Relations to be *inter Ens & Nihil*; and what difference between *Nihil & non Ens?* You ſay, That you have over and over ſhewed, That Confor-

mity to the Rule of the Condition, doth consist in *indivisibili*. Indeed you have divers times affirmed, That all Conformity is of that nature, but I could never yet see it proved. But why do you now speak of Conformity to the Rule of the Condition? I take Conformity to the Rule of the Precept to be our Personal Righteousness, and the Sincerity of that Conformity to be the Sincerity of this Righteousness. And this Righteousness, though it be sincere, I hold to be imperfect, because the Conformity to the Rule is imperfect. [*Sincerity* (saith Master *Blake*) *is said to be the New Rule, or the Rule of the New Covenant. But this is no Rule, but our Duty, taking the Abstract for the Concrete; Sincerity for sincere walking, and this according to the Rule of the Law, not to reach it, but in all parts to aim at it, and have respect unto it.* Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect to all thy Commandments, *Psal.* 119. 6. *And this is our Inherent Righteousness, which in reference to its Rule* (*N. B.*) *labours under many imperfections*]. And a little before he saith thus, [*I know no other Rule but the Old Rule, the Rule of the Moral Law: that is with me a Rule, a perfect Rule, the only Rule*].

Of the Coven. *chap.* 16. *pag.* 111.

3. It seems very incongruous to grant, that *Apoc.* 22. 11. [*Be holy still*] doth import an encrease of Holiness; and yet to deny, that [*Be righteous still*] doth import an increase of Righteousness. For any thing I know, some on the contrary may as well say, That the latter words import an increase of Righteousness, and yet the other no increase of Holiness. Whereas you speak of varying the sense according to the variety of Subjects, you take it for granted, That here the Subjects are various; whereas both by this, and divers other places before cited, it seems clear to me, that the Subjects, *viz.* Righteousness and Holiness are really the same one with the other. For the *Formale* of Righteousness, what is it but Conformity to the Law, the only Rule of Righteousness? And why such Conformity may not be more or less, I am yet to learn. That place indeed, as many other, speaks of a true Personal Righteousness in the Saints, but yet not of a Perfect Righteousness in them; and consequently not of such a Righteousness, as whereby they are justified, except it be only in some sort, and in some

some measure, which is not the Justification about which we contend. This Imperfect Righteousness is measured by the Law of Works, as a Rule, though it be accepted only by the gracious condescension of the Gospel.

To *Ephes.* 4. 24. you give many Answers, but they seem but so many Evasions. 39.

1. I think there is no Question, but the Apostle speaks by way of Precept and Exhortation. *q. d.* If you have indeed learned Christ, and have been taught by him, you have learned to do so and so; therefore have a care to do so. Surely the Apostles words import a duty required, and so implicitly contain a Precept or Exhortation.

2. That he speaks as well to Believers, True Believers, as mere Professors, is as little to be doubted. For he speaks unto them upon a supposition, that they had learned Christ, and had been taught by him; which though it may belong to mere Professors, yet to true Believers much rather.

3. If the New Man, which is created in Righteousness and Holiness, may encrease, as you grant, then surely Righteousness and Holiness, in which the New Man is created, and without which the New Man is nothing, must increase also. To say, That the New Man may increase in Holiness, but not in Righteousness, is for one that would say any thing, so that he may but δουλεύειν τῇ ὑποθέσει. As well might it be said, That the New Man is created in Holiness, but not in Righteousness.

4. The Form of Righteousness is Conformity to the Law, to which we must labour to conform still more and more, not only *extensivè*, but also *intensivè*.

5. The very conjunction of the words here, as in other places, shews that they are used as ἰσοδυναμοῦντα. Besides, how we should give unto God the things that are God's, and to Men the things that are Mens, and not conform to the Law, which doth prescribe our Duty towards God, and towards Men, I cannot see: and surely Conformity to the Law, is the Righteousness now in question.

1. If we be justified from the Accusation of *Reatus pœnæ primæ Legis propter peccatum*; What need is there of any other justification? [*Upon the Laws Convictions* (saith Mr. *Blake*) *there may follow Gospel-Aggravations; but Conviction is the Work of the Law*]. If Con- *Ibid.* Of the Coven. *c.* 14. *p.* 95.

Conviction, then surely Condemnation. If the Law do not condemn, what can? And what can the Law condemn for, but for sin? It is the Law which is the Ministration of Condemnation, 2 *Cor.* 3. 9. *By the Law is the knowledg of sin*, Rom. 3. 20.

2. For the accusation of *Reatus pœnæ Novæ Legis ob non præstitam Conditionem*, it is no new Accusation, but a making good of a former Accusation; and so *Reatus pœnæ Novæ Legis*, is but to be left *in reatu pœnæ Veteris Legis*; save that *aggravatâ ex Evangelio culpâ ipsa etiam pœna aggravatur*.

3. I confess, I was not before acquainted with these two Justifications which you speak of: I did not find them in your *Aphorisms*, but only two sorts of Righteousness as requisite to one and the same Justification, so I understood it. But truly now that you lay open your conception more than before, I can see no solidity in it. We are justified by the Righteousness of Christ participated by Faith; but not by Faith, as being it self our Righteousness. Faith is indeed required unto Justification, yet not as our Righteousness, but as a Condition, Instrument, or Means (for I would not strive about words) whereby we partake of Christ's Righteousness. I see not, that the Scripture doth speak of such a Two-fold Justification, one by Christ and his Righteousuess, another by Faith as our Righteousness; but only of one Justification of Christ through Faith. *By him all that believe are justified*, Acts 13. 39.

Ibid. (*p.* 47.) *Non-reatus pœnæ* is not Inherent Righteousness, of which I expressly spake. I take it to be really the same with Holiness. What you cite therefore out of *Gataker* and *Placæus*, is nothing against me, I speaking of Righteousness in one sense, and they in another. Besides, you seem to mistake the meaning of Mr. *Gataker*'s words: for *Sons* is as much as *reus culpæ*, and *insons* as much as *non-reus culpæ*; whereas you seem to take *Sons* for *Reus pœnæ*, and *Insons* for *Non-reus pœnæ*; how-ever his words are not to our purpose.

Ibid. 1. I see not how either here or elsewhere you infringe that, which I said about the Materiality and Formality, as well of Holiness as of Righteousness.

2. As Holiness (you grant) is a Conformity to the Law, as it doth *constituere debitum officii*, so I conceive is

is Righteouſneſs, (Inherent I ſtill mean) and not a Conformity to the Rule, as it conſtituteth, *Conditionem præmii obtinendi, & pœnæ vitandæ, ſi nimirùm ſeclusâ omni conſideratione officii, Conditio tantùm ut Conditio conſideretur.* (*p.* 48.)

1. Acceptance as taken for Accepting * as Righteous, or Accounting juſt, is (I think) as much as Juſtifying. *Ibid.* & 40.

* *Juſtification is by the conſent of all men* (*I mean Proteſtants*) *a remiſſion of our ſins, and accepting of us as Righteous*, Mr. *Kendal againſt* Mr. Goodwin, *cap.* 4. *p.* 138.

2. I did not (nor I ſuppoſe thoſe other Divines by you mentioned) ſpeak ſo generally, but to preſuppoſe Faith, whereby our Perſons are accepted in Chriſt, and then our Actions. *By Faith* Abel *offered a more excellent Sacrifice*, &c. *Heb.* 11. 4. At length, after many words, which touch not me, in your *6th*, you grant as much as I did, or do deſire, *viz.* That *our Perſons muſt be juſtified and reconciled, before our external Obedience can be accepted.* Whereas you there add, That *it was not as they were an imperfect Conformity to the Law of Works, that* Abel's *Works were accepted*: I anſwer, It was not indeed by the Law of Works; yet as they were a ſincere, though imperfect Conformity to that Law, as a Rule, ſo they were accepted by the New Covenant. The Law of Works directs, the Covenant of Grace accepts, though we come ſhort of what the Law requires.

[*The Law* (as Mr. *Blake* ſaith) *ſtill commands us, though the Covenant in Chriſt, through the abundant Grace of it, upon the terms that it requires and accepts, frees us from the Sentence of it*]. And again, [*A perfection of Sufficiency to attain the end I willingly grant, God condeſcending through rich Grace to crown weak Obedience: In this ſence our Imperfection hath its perfectneſs; otherwiſe I muſt ſay, That our Inherent Righteouſneſs is an Imperfect Righteouſneſs, in an imperfect Conformity to the Rule of Righteouſneſs*, &c.] He means the Law of Works, which (as before noted) he ſaith is, *a Rule, a perfect Rule, the only Rule.* Of the Coven. *ch.* 16. *p.* 9, 10. *Ibid. p.* 111, 112.

1. I ſhall not deny, but that our Faith and Obedience may be ſaid to be juſtified from the accuſation of unſoundneſs: Yet I think, That this is but a making good of our Juſtification againſt the Accuſation of being Sinners. For beſides that the unſoundneſs of Faith (and ſo 40, & 41.

of

of Obedience) is sin; besides this (I say) if our Faith be not sound, it is in vain, we are yet in our sins, we lie under the Curse and Condemnation of the Law, there being no freedom for us without Faith.

2. I know none that say, Our Actions are justified through Christ's Merit by the Law of Works. For my part I should say, We and our Actions are justified from the Law of Works, *i. e.* from the condemnation of it, God for Christ's sake accepting us and our Actions, notwithstanding our imperfection, for which the Law, if we should be sentenced by it, would condemn us. But here by the way, let me observe this, That your retractation of what you said in your *Aphorisms*, doth seem to manifest thus much, That when you composed those *Aphorisms*, you either knew not, or liked not that Twofold Justification, which now you so often speak of, and somewhere say, That my ignorance in this Point is it, that doth mainly darken all my Discourse. That common saying is not always true, Δευτέραι φροντίδες φρονιμώτεραι.

For my words; 1. I see not why those, [*Acquitting us from all sin*] should offend you. For you might see by what I there said, That I meant the not-imputing of any sin unto us. And so the Phrases used in Scripture, of God, *not remembring our sins, his covering them, casting them behind his back, into the bottom of the Sea*, &c. they all import such an acquitting of us from sin, as I intended; not as if God did account us to be without sin, which were false, but that God doth not charge sin upon us, *viz.* so as to exact satisfaction for sin from us. I meant the very same with Mr. *Gataker* in the words which you cited *p.* 39. *Non hoc dicitur, Deum apud se judicare, illos pro quorum peccatis universis Christus satisfecit, nihil mali unquam commisisse, aut boni debiti omisisse; sed eodem habere loco quoad mortis reatum, & jus ad vitam æternam, ac si nihil vel mali admisissent, vel boni debiti omisissent.* Thus Christ speaks to the Church, *Cant.* 4. 7. *Thou art all fair, my Love, and there is no spot in thee.* What? may some say, Is there no spot in the Church? No, none in her, so as to be imputed to her. *Sine maculâ deputatur, quia culpa non imputatur*, as one doth no less truly than elegantly express it. You your self yeeld as much as I desire, or as my words import, *viz.* That God acquitteth

Gilber. ad Loc.

quitteth us from all ſin, ſo as it induceth an obligation to puniſhment.

2. When you ſay; That to acquit us from the Obligation of the Old Law, is one Juſtification, and to juſtifie us againſt the accuſation of being ſo obliged, is another Juſtification; I confeſs (*Davus ſum, non Oedipus*) I do not well underſtand what you mean, for to my apprehenſion theſe are one and the ſame. Me-thinks it muſt needs be, That what doth acquit us from the Obligation of the Old Law, doth alſo *eo nomine* juſtifie us againſt the Accuſation of being ſo obliged. For how are we acquitted from the Obligation, if not juſtified againſt the Accuſation of being obliged?

3. I marvel why you ſhould trouble your ſelf with ſpeaking of the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and of final unbelief, when as you could not but know, that I ſpake of all ſin, from which we may be juſtified. Why might not one as well quarrel with thoſe words of the Apoſtle, Acts 13. 39. *By him all that believe are juſtified from all things*, &c.

4. I grant the New Covenant not to be violated but by final unbelief, yet (as I expreſly added in that very place which you take hold on) ſo that this be rightly underſtood. For the right underſtanding of it, I ſaid ſomething before; and for further explication, I refer you to Mr. *Blake* of the Covenant, *Chap.* 33.

5. But in the next you do moſt ſtrangely, even without any cauſe that I can ſee, μισλεγειν, and (as they ſay) *fluctus in ſimpulo excitare*. That [firſt our Perſons, and then our Duties and Actions may properly be ſaid to be juſtified, that is, accepted as juſt, and acquitted from all accuſation brought againſt them, though in themſelves they be not ſuch, but that ſin doth cleave unto them] why ſhould this ſeem ſuch horrid Doctrine, as that your Heart ſhould deteſt it?

1. I ſpeak of good Actions: for it is abſurd to ſay, That evil Actions are accepted as juſt, though we may be ſo accepted notwithſtanding our evil Actions.

2. I plainly ſay, That ſin doth cleave to our good Actions; yet (I ſay) God doth accept them as juſt, notwithſtanding the imperfection of them, and the ſin that doth cleave unto them. If this be offenſive to you, as well (I think) may you be offended at that *Nehem.* 13. 22.

13. 22. *Remember me, O Lord, concerning this, and ſpare me according to the greatneſs of thy Mercy.* And ſo at that 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. *You alſo as lively ſtones are built up a Spiritual Houſe, an Holy Prieſthood, to offer up Spiritual Sacrifices, acceptable unto God through Jeſus Chriſt.* Neither is there any reaſon why thoſe words [*acquitted from all accuſation brought againſt them*] ſhould diſtaſte you. For what though an Accuſation be true, if yet in ſome other reſpect it be of no force? May not they be properly ſaid to be acquitted from all Accuſation, who notwithſtanding the Accuſation, are freed from condemnation? What matter is it how we are accuſed, ſo long as we are ſure not to be condemned? Therefore the Apoſtle uſeth theſe Expreſſions as equipollent, [*Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect?*] and [*Who is he that condemneth?*] Rom. 8. 33, 34. Might you not as vehemently fall upon thoſe words of the Apoſtle, [*Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge,* &c.] as you do upon mine? Might you not ſay, Why? I will lay this, and that, and that, and ten thouſand things beſides to their charge? Yea, but when you have done all you can, to what purpoſe is it? *For who is he that condemneth them, notwithſtanding all the Accuſations brought againſt them?* Theſe very words of the Apoſtle doth *Ameſius* alledg in the former of thoſe Sections which you cite. And if (as you ſay) all may be there fully ſeen in *Ameſius*, that you would ſay in this, then I ſee not that you would ſay any thing againſt me, as indeed you do ſay nothing. But what do you mean by thoſe words, [*and that as to the Law of Works*] which by a Parentheſis you thruſt in among mine? As if I meant, that as well our Actions as our Perſons are accepted as juſt, and acquitted from all condemnation by the Law of Works. Truly I think *tàm quàm*, as well the one as the other, that is indeed neither the one nor the other. The Law doth convince of ſin, and (as much as in it lies) condemn for ſin, both us and our Actions, even the beſt of them: But by the New Covenant, Through Faith in Chriſt we are accepted as juſt, though guilty of manifold ſins; and our Actions are accepted alſo, though full of imperfection. When you ſay, That the *Reatus Culpæ* cannot poſſibly be removed, or remitted, though I think it is but a ſtriving about words, which I do not love, yet

Medull. lib. 1. *c.* 27. §. 20.

I cannot assent unto it. For I think it is truly and properly said to be remitted or pardoned; neither doth that seem proper or pertinent, which you add by way of Explication, [that is, *The Man cannot be, or justly esteemed to be a Man that hath not sinned*]. *Quid tum postea?* Cannot therefore the guilt of sin be remitted? Yea, how should sin be remitted, if it were not committed? I think it is as proper to say, *Remittere culpam*, as *Remittere pœnam*. Surely if I may argue from the frequent use of Phrases, and hence infer the propriety of them, as you did, there is nothing more usual in Scripture, (and so in other Writings, and in common Speech) then to say, that Sins, Faults, Offences are remitted. *Grotius* saith, That ἀφιναι, which in Latin is *Remittere*, is as much as *missum facere*; and that the Greek Scholiasts usually expound it by ἀμελεῖν, *i. e.* to neglect, not to regard, to pass over, (as *Prov.* 19. 11. *to pass over a transgression*) and that therefore ἁμαρτήματα ἀφιναι, is *peccata missa facere*, which the Scripture (he saith) following the Metaphor further, calls *peccata in mare projicere*, Mich. 7. 19. It is true, Sin is said to be remitted in reference unto Punishment: *Remittere*, or *missa facere peccata*, (as *Grotius* saith) is as much as *punire nolle*. Yet this hinders not but that sin, or the guilt of sin is properly said to be remitted or pardoned; yea (I think) it doth confirm it. For if it be proper to say, That God will not punish sin, and this is as much as to remit or pardon sin; then it is proper to say, That God doth remit or pardon sin. In a word therefore, my words, about which you make so much adoe, are such as that I see not why any should stumble at them. They do not import, that our Actions, even the best of them, if strictly examined, are not sinful; or that God doth not see any sin in them; but only that God doth pardon and pass by the sinfulness of them, and accept them in Christ, (who is the High-Priest, that doth bear, and so take away the Iniquity of our holy things, *Exod.* 28. 38.) as if they had no sin in them. Neither do I see why you should detest this justifying of our Actions, and yet grant the justifying of our Persons. Your Reasons seem to make as much against the one as against the other. For are not our Persons sinful as well as our Actions? Surely if the Action be sinful, the Person whose Action it is must

De Satisf. pag. 52.

Ibid. p. 53.

must needs be so too. And though you pass over the next, because you reverse your former Assertion, yet in that which I there said, you might have seen enough to vindicate me from all that you have here said against me.

42. 1. You grant what I say.

2. I have said before, That though (in mine Opinion) sin may properly be said to be remitted, yet this is in reference unto punishment.

3. You had no reason to imagine, that I should think, that my Actions, or the Actions of the best upon Earth, can be justified against all Accusations, as if they were absolutely good and perfect; when in that very place I spake of the imperfection and iniquity that is in our best Actions, and how it is through Christ covered, and not imputed unto us. Yea, and immediately I cited divers places of Scripture (*viz. Eccles.* 7. 20. *James* 3. 2. 1 *John* 1. 8, 9. *Job* 9. 4. *Exod.* 28. 38.) to prove, that neither our Persons, nor our Actions are so righteous, but that we may be accused of, and condemned for sin in them, and so without the mercy of God in Christ must be. It is strange how you should pass by all this, it being directly before your eyes, and should raise a suspicion, as if I should mean quite contrary.

Ibid. 1. It will not follow that our Persons being once justified by Christ, afterward they may be justified by our Works, when once our Works themselves are all justified in that sense as I explained it, *viz.* That first it is meant only of good Works; and then that God doth not justifie those good Works for their own sake, as if they were fully and perfectly Righteous, but for Christ's sake pardoning and passing by the imperfection that is in them.

De Just. Act. c. 33. *Memb.* 2. *Illud semper retineatur, (inquit* Davenantius) *hanc acceptationem operum pendere ex praevia acceptatione personæ in Christo; Cum enim ipse renatis carnem peccatricem adhuc gestent, & opera illorum omnia carnis vitium redoleant, Deus neque ipsos, neque eorum opera grata haberet, nisi & hos & illa in Christo imagis quàm in seipsis amplexaretur.* What you say of *Chamier* and others, as being against the meritoriousness of Works merited by Christ, might well have been spared, as being nothing at all against me, who am far from making our Works meritorious, when I make even the best of them

them imperfect, and to need pardon. 2. It is evident by this very Section, to which you now reply, that I ſpake only of good Actions. For how abſurd and ſenſleſs were it to ſay, that our Sins are not fully and perfectly righteous, as I there ſay that our Works are not? The two former Sections alſo clearly ſhew of what Works I ſpake; ſo that here you do but *nodum in ſcirpo quærere.*

1. Aſſerting may well enough be called Confeſſing, though it be that, and ſomewhat more. *Ibid.* 43, & 44.

2. I cannot tell what Judgment ſome others may be of, I ſpeak for my ſelf.

3. I take all ſin to be againſt the Law, as it is diſtinguiſhed from the Goſpel, though ſome ſins may be aggravated by the Goſpel. Of that Law I ſuppoſe St. *John* ſpake, ſaying, *Sin is a tranſgreſſion of the Law*, 1 Joh. 3. 4. And St. *Paul*, *By the Law is the knowledge of ſin*, Rom. 3. 20. And again, *I had not known ſin but by the Law: for I had not known luſt*, (or as the Margent hath it, *concupiſcence, viz.* to be ſin) *except the Law had ſaid, Thou ſhalt not covet*, Rom. 7. 7. I think it is the common judgment of Divines, that every ſin is againſt ſome of the Ten Commandments.

4. It is no hard matter to conceive how unbelief, and neglect of the Sacraments, *&c.* are ſins againſt the Precepts of the Decalogue. The firſt precept requires us to have the Lord, and him only, for our God; and ſo to believe whatſoever he doth reval unto us, and to perform whatſoever he doth require of us. The ſecond Precept requires us to Worſhip God as he himſelf doth preſcribe; and conſequently not to neglect any of God's Ordinances; See Mr. *Cawdrey* and Mr. *Palmer* of the Sabbath, *Part.* 2. *Chap.* 4. §. 21, 22, 23. What you add after, makes all for me in this particular, only ſome things ſeem meet to be obſerved.

1. This (I confeſs) to me is ſtrange Philoſophy, That the Earth, of which Man's Body was made, ceaſed not to be Earth ſtill, when it was made Man. As well may you ſay, That *Adam*'s rib, of which *Eve* was formed, ceaſed not to be a Rib ſtill; and ſo that all the Elemenrs retain their ſeveral Natures in all mixt Bodies.

2. *The Precept and Threatning* (you ſay) *are parts of the New Law, though they be common with the Old.*

Here

Here you seem to grant, That nothing is commanded, or threatned in the New Law, which is not commanded or threatned in the Old. Me-thinks then you should not make a Two-fold Righteousness, and a Two-fold Justification; one in respect of the Old Law, another in respect of the New. The Precept [*believe*] belongs to the Old Law; but as it is not only a Precept, but also a Condition, upon performance of which Salvation is promised, [*Believe, and thou shalt be saved*] so it belongs to the New Law. So this Threatning [*If thou dost not believe, thou shalt perish*] belongs to the Old Law, as threatning death for every sin, and consequently for unbelief, which is a sin; and it belongs to the New Law, as leaving an Unbeliever under the condemnation of the Old Law both for that sin of unbelief, and also for all other sins, from the guilt of which he cannot be freed, because he doth not perform the Condition, which the New Law to that end doth require of him. And (as I have before noted) the Condemnation of an Unbeliever is now increased, as his Sin is, by neglecting Salvation offered upon condition of believing.

3. You say, That *the promissory part of the Law of Works doth not oblige*. But your Reason seems invalid, *Quia cessat materia, vel capacitas subjecti*. You mean, no Man can perform the Condition; and so no Man is capable of the Promise made upon that Condition. But why may it not be said, That as the Precept, which is also the Condition, ceaseth not, though none be able to obey it; so the Promise doth remain, though none can enjoy the benefit of it? It may seem unreasonable, that the Threatning should still be in force, and the Promise be quite taken away.

4. You say again, That *the Earth, of which Man's Body was made, doth still retain the form of Earth*; which surely doth need further Explication, or Confirmation, or both.

5. *The threatning of the New Law* (you say) *hath something proper to the New Law:* But for any thing I see, the New Law doth threaten nothing, which the Old Law doth not threaten; though as by the New Law there is an aggravation of sin, so there will be an increase of condemnation.

Whereas

6. Whereas you ſay, that the right ſtating and clear apprehenſion of this part, (*viz.* of the difference between the Law and the Goſpel, and how far the Law of Works is abrogated) is of greater moment and difficulty by far than my Animadverſions take notice of, or than any thing (as to difficulty) that I deal with; truly my deſire was, and ſo is, only to give you ſome hints for the further clearing of things in the Second Edition of your *Aphoriſms*. But if you think, that here in this Section, which is ſomewhat long, you have ſufficiently explicated thoſe Points, I am not of your mind.

1. All that you here ſay is nothing to my *Animadverſion*; only you ſtrive a little about the acceptation of thoſe words [*the Moral Law*]. 44.

2. Neither do I make the Moral Law as taken for the Precept conjunct with the Threatning, a true part of the New Law: yet the Moral Law ſo taken, being not diſſolved or abrogated by the New Law, as you grant, Unbelievers, while they remain ſuch, both for their unbelief, and for their other ſins, are under condemnation, as belonging unto them by the Old Law, there being no Remedy provided for them by the New Law; which hath no other threatning, (I think) but that it leaves Unbelievers to the Old Law, and the condemnation of it.

1. I do not diſlike your Theſis, [*That Chriſt died not to ſatisfie for the violation of the Covenant of Grace*] as you underſtand it, *viz.* for final unbelief. Yet I hold, That ſuch as profeſs the Goſpel, and live in thoſe ſins, which are not conſiſtent with true and ſincere Faith, do for the time violate the Covenant of Grace; and for ſuch violation of that Covenant Chriſt died, or elſe all ſuch are left without Remedy. I am in this fully of Mr. *Blakes* mind, [*As a wife* (ſaith he) *by adultery, ſo they by ſin forſake the Covenant, by which they ſtand betrothed; and by conſequence it muſt needs follow, that Chriſt died for breach of the Covenant of Grace, as well as for breach of the Covenant of Works; unleſs we will ſay, That all Men by name Chriſtians, and found in any of theſe ſins, are in a loſt and unrecoverable condition, joyning with thoſe that have ſaid, That there is no Grace or Pardon for thoſe that fall into ſin after Baptiſm. That he died not for their ſins, that live and die in final impenitency and unbelief, may be eaſily gran-*] Ibid. & 45. Of the Coven. chap. 33.

ted: and that rises to no more, than that he died not for those, that finally and unrecoverably break Covenant with him].

2. Whereas you confess, That for unbelief and impenitency, though it be not final, Men remain *obligati ad pœnam per Legem Naturæ*, but deny it as to the proper Obligation of the New Law; I conceive that the New Law providing no Remedy for them, while they remain such; in this respect they are as well by the New Law *obligati ad pœnam* for the time, as final Unbelievers and Impenitents are for ever. You grant the Gospel doth *non-liberare*, while Men continue in Unbelief; yet you conceive, That it doth not *obligare ad pœnam propriè, viz. ad non-liberationem, & ad pœnam majorem*. Now I conceive that while it doth *non-liberare*, it may be said, *obligare ad non-liberationem*; though I should rather like to say, That it doth *relinquere in statu non-liberationis*, and so *majoris pœnæ ob contemptum gratiæ, & misericordiæ oblatæ*. In your Similitude, The Malefactor, while he refuses to come in, and submit to the Terms upon which Pardon is offered, remains in a state of Condemnation, though the sentence be not executed upon him, except he continue in his refusal of the offer unto the term prefixed. But you profess your self willing to acknowledg, That this *non-liberatio* may in some sort be called *Pœna*; and truly I think, that *Pœna Nova Legis non alia est, quàm non-liberatio à pœnâ veteris Legis; hoc tamen semper addito, pœnam veteris Legis, ob neglectum liberationis in Lege Novâ oblatæ, graviorem redd.*

45. I mean [*Actually in the state of Damnation*] and you grant as much as I desire, *viz.* That they are obliged even for that sin unto death, *per Legem Naturæ, & non liberati per Legem Gratiæ*. Why then should you deny, that they are actually obliged to Damnation? Will you put a difference between Death and Damnation? Or betwixt obliged, and actually obliged? *He that believeth not, is condemned already*, John 3. 18. therefore he is actually under condemnation, and so remains, as long as he remains in unbelief; *The Wrath of God abideth on him*, John 3. 36. That the Sentence is not yet executed, but upon believing he may be freed from the execution of it, is another thing.

The

The Parenthesis, which you say, is wanting in your *Aphorisms*, might help to make the words more clear; as they stand, they seem obscure: which is all that I would have observed. *Ibid.*

Neither am I willing to fall upon either Logical or Philosophical Disputes; yet I am also unwilling to recede from received Opinions, except I see urgent cause for it. Now that an Accident must have a Subject to exist in, as it is generally held, so I am perswaded it is true. *Burgersdicius* (whose authority I may well enough oppose to *Scheiblers*) saith, *Accidens est Ens substantia inhærens.* Indeed he saith, *Relationes non tam inhærent alicui subjecto, quàm adhærent:* but he doth not deny that they do *inhærere.* For he saith, *Relatio ejusmodi accidens est, quod non tantùm (N. B.) in aliquo est, ut in subjecto, sed refertur etiam ad aliud.* It is usually one Argument which our Divines have against Transubstantiation, that thereby Accidents are made to exist without a Subject. *Scheibler* grants, that an Accident hath not existence by it self, that it is not αὐθοπόστατον, (so it should be, not ἀνθοποστατον). Now every thing that hath Existence, must (I think) either exist by it self, or in some other thing. *Ibid.* & 46. *Logic.* lib. 1 cap. 7.

2. *Adjunctum & Subjectum*, and *Effectum & Causa*, are not so contradistinct, but that the same thing may be *Adjunctum & Effectum*, and so the same thing *Subjectum & Causa.*

3. Whereas *Scheibler* saith, *Actio transiens nullum habet subjectum, ne quidem ipsum Patiens, ut visum est*; I say, *Ego illud nondum vidi, nec vel verum, vel verisimile mihi videtur.* I think, *Omnis Actio subjectatur in Patiente:* and this I hold to be true even of Immanent Actions, which though they have the Agent for the Subject, yet it is because the Agent is there also the Patient; and it is not *quà Agens*, but *quà Patiens*, that it is the subject of the Action. See Mr. *Kendal* against Mr. *Goodwin*, *chap.* 4. *p.* 135.

4. He argues thus, *Actio ut sic non dicit nisi egressum à virtute activâ alicujus Agentis. Egressus autem opponitur τῷ esse in. Resp.* 1. *Actio ut sic necessario infert Passionem. Fieri enim non potest, ut aliquid agat, nisi etiam aliquid patiatur. Ergo Actio non tantum dicit egressum à virtute activâ, verùm etiam infert receptionem in Patiente.* 2. *Actio & Passio sunt idem*

 motus;

motus; sed Actio vocatur quatenus ab Agente procedit, Passio autem quatenus in Patiente recipitur. Etiamsi igitur Actio & Passio formaliter differant, cum tamen realiter idem sint, si Passio est in subjecto, Actionem etiam in subjecto esse necesse est.

5. Whereas you doubt whether *Scotus* be not right in holding that Immanent Acts are in the Predicament of Quality, that (as divers other Passages) doth shew that you are much inclined to that which doth cross the common Opinion; which surely is in it self very dangerous, though (I know) you are prudent and sober-minded, so that there is little cause of fear this way in respect of you. Yet wanton Wits, and unstable Spirits, may extend your Notions further than you intended them; and therefore, especially considering the times into which we are faln, you have need to be wary: but *dictum sapienti sat est.*

46. See Mr. *Kendal* against Mr. *Goodwin*, chap. 4. p. 130, 131. *Ibid.*

Though we cannot know God to Perfection, yet we may and must know him so, as to remove from him all Imperfection, and consequently all composition. The more simple any thing is, *ceteris paribus*, the more perfect it is: Therefore God being most Perfect, he is most Simple.

This contains only a Logical Dispute about the Predicaments and Relations. Now for the Predicaments, though I do not say that they all note real Beings distinct one from another, so Action and Passion do not; yet I think they all note real Beings, *i. e.* Beings which are not meerly rational or imaginary. And how you should question this, especially of Substance, Quantity and Quality, (which are more than two) I cannot conceive. And for Relations, hear *Aquinas*, whose judgment (besides that he giveth reason for what he saith) with me is of far more weight than of your late Authors. *Quidam posuerunt Relationem non esse rem naturæ, sed rationis tantùm. Quod quidem apparet esse falsum ex hoc, quòd ipsæ res naturalem ordinem & habitudinem habent ad invicem.* Yet as there are *Entia Rationis*, so there are *Relationes Rationis*. Yea, *Aquinas* shews, that *Quædam Relationes sunt quantum ad utrumque extremum res naturæ*, &c. *Quandoque verò in uno extremo est res naturæ, & in altero extremo est res rationis tantùm, nempe cum duo extrema non sunt ejusdem ordinis.*

Part. 1. Quest. 13. Art. 7. *in Corp.* *Ibid.* *Et Vide. ibid. ad 2. & ad 4.*

dinis, &c. And of this latter sort he notes the Relations are, which are betwixt God and the Creatures. *Cum igitur (inquit) Deus sit extra totum ordinem creaturæ, & omnes creaturæ ordinentur ad ipsum, & non è converso, manifestum est, quòd creaturæ realiter referuntur ad Deum, sed in Deo non est aliqua realis relatio ad creaturas, sed secundum rationem tantùm, in quantum creaturæ referuntur ad ipsum. Et sic nihil prohibet hujusmodi nomina importantia relationem ad creaturam, prædicari de Deo ex tempore, non propter mutationem aliquam ipsius, sed propter creaturæ mutationem, sicut columna fit dextra animali, nullâ mutatione circa ipsam existente, sed animali transluto.* And again, *Creatio (inquit) activè considerata significat actionem divinam, quæ est ejus essentia cum relatione ad creaturam. Sed relatio in Deo ad creaturam non est realis, sed secundum rationem tantùm: relatio verò creaturæ ad Deum est realis*, &c. *Aquin.* Part 1. Quæst. 45 Art. 3. Ad 1.

Heereboord, p. 179. saith, *Pater non significat aliquid, quod humana natura propriè & per se insit, sed quomodo ille, qui sic dicitur, se habeat ad filium.* Resp. *Pater est Relatum, nempe Substantia cum Relatione ad aliud: Paternitas est Relatio, & ineſt subjecto, nempe homini, qui est Pater. Quod* p. 184. *dicit Relationem esse medium inter Ens reale & Nihil, id tantum dicit, non probat.*

You say, That however you are confident, that Relation is not *verè Ens*; yet you will not say, that it is *Nihil* or *Non Ens*; and you said before, (as I noted, and it is most sure) *Inter Ens & non Ens non datur medium.* The distinction of *Medium Participationis*, & *Medium Negationis* will not here serve. For certainly *Contradictoria non admittunt medium Negationis. Aut Homo, aut non Homo: aut Ens, aut non Ens: non datur medium.* The Authors to which you refer me, I have not, save only Dr. *Twisse*; but he is of another Edition, viz. in *Folio*, so that I cannot find the place, as you cite it.

1. He that is justified, is so freed from all condemnation, that he is liable to no condemnation, *Rom.* 8. 1, 33, 34. And he that is so freed, is perfectly freed, and consequently perfectly justified, though the freedom from condemnation, and so the justification be not so fully and *Ibid.* & 47, 48, 49.

perfectly made manifest as it shall be. The freedom from condemnation *per sententiam Judicis*, of which you speak, doth not add to the freedom it self, but only to the manifestation of it. The Sentence is indeed past already, *John* 3. 18. though it be not so solemnly pronounced, as it shall be.

2. He that is freed from all Condemnation, is certainly freed from all Accusation, so as that no Accusation can be prejudicial to him; though he may be accused, yet it matters not, seeing he cannot be condemned. Else the Apostle had triumphed before the Victory, saying, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge*, &c. *Who is he that condemneth*? Rom. 8. 33, 34.

3. The Apostle doth not only say, *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus*, Rom. 8. 1. but also, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect*? v. 33. *viz.* when they are in Christ, and so justified. Which in effect is as much, as if it were said, There shall be no condemnation to such. But you grant, That other Texts speak as much, and that such neither now are, nor ever shall be under condemnation. Yet you say, That they would be to morrow condemned, if no more were done than is done. You mean (I suppose) if they did not renew the Act of Faith; but (I say, and you grant it) they who are once justified, though they sin daily, yea, and may lie long in sin, as *David* did, yet they shall renew the Act of Faith, and have the joy of God's Salvation restored unto them, as he prayed, *Psal.* 51. 12. Neither is there any intercision of Justification, though there may be a privation of the joy and comfort of it.

To your Objections, I answer, *Ad* 1. He that is once justified, can contract no guilt so as to fall from his Justification. Besides, when I spake of Justification being perfect, I only mean, That a Justified Person is justified, not in part only, but fully, *i. e.* from all sins which at present he is guilty of: not but that his Justification hath need to be renewed in respect of new sins; and so his Justification may be said to increase *extensivè*, as extending to more and more sins, as they are increased more and more. But that in this respect we shall be more fully justified at the last Judgment than we are now, is but

but by accident, and not from the Nature or Essence of Justification.

Ad 2. Justification *per Sententiam Judicis, & Sententiam magis publicam*, makes (as I said) but for the more full and perfect manifestation of it. *In alio judicio* (*inquit* Maccovius.) *Christus non rem justificaturus* (*N. B.*) *est credentes, quam declaraturus est ex operibus eorum, eos credidisse in hac vitâ, & justificatos fuisse.* Thus undoubtedly is that to be understood in *Acts* 3. 19. For without question no sins shall then (at the last Judgment) be blotted out, which were not blotted out before: but the blotting of them out shall then more fully appear than before. *In resurrectione à mortuis*, (*inquit* Rainoldus *noster*) *Christus, qui venset judicatum vivos & mortuos, quemadmodum ipse pronunciat, ea quæ ligaverint ipsius ministri, ligatum iri in cœlis, ita quæ prius in terrâ remissa fuerint, confirmabit ipse suâ sententiâ, ut remissa & delata in æternum, omnia nimirum fidelium & sanctorum peccata. Quare quacunque, & quorumcunque peccata remissa fuerint in hoc sæculo, etiam in futuro sæculo remittentur, quoniam autem peccata non fuerint remissa in hoc sæculo, non remittentur in futuro, nempe peccata hominum incredulorum & impiorum.* Petrus, Act. 3. *hoc locupletissimè confirmavit.* —*Resipiscite* (*inquit*) *ut deleantur peccata vestra, postquam venerint tempora refrigerationis, &c.* —*Nostri cum affirmant peccata non remitti in futuro sæculo, sed in isto tantum, negant id quod astruunt Pontificii, peccata remissum iri in futuro sæculo, quæ in præsenti non remittebantur. Nam Christus confirmabit sententiam suam, quam prius tulit, cum fuerit sententiam illam novissimam in ultimo judicio. Itaque peccata nulla tum remittentur, nisi quæ quisque testimonio conscientiæ suæ hîc percipit remissa esse in præsenti sæculo.* —*Certè ipse* (Bellarminus) *agnovit, vel agnoscere potuit è verbis* * Calvini *qua citat, nos hoc judicio esse, præsertim in eo ipso loco* Calvini *quem citat, ubi dat* Calvinus, *Christum* (Mat. 12. 32.) *hâc partitione usum esse, quâ judicium complexus est, quod sentit in hâc vitâ uniuscujusque conscientia, & postremum illud, quod palam* (*N. B.*) *in resurrectione feretur.* For *peccata futura*, which you also here speak of, I have said enough in answer to the former Objection. And you

De Justif. Disp. 7.

De Libr. Apocryph. Prælect. 171.

* *Instit. lib.* 3. *c.* 1. §. 7.

may see much more to this purpose in the Account given to the Parliament by the Ministers which they sent to *Oxford*, p. 7, 8, 9.

Ad 3. Castigatory Punishment is no part of that Condemnation, from which we are freed by Justification, but a means to preserve us from falling into Condemnation, see 1 *Cor.* 11. 32.

Ad 4. Though the continuance of our Justification here be conditional, *viz.* upon condition of the continuance of our Faith, yet the continuance of the Condition being certain, so also is the continuance of our Justification. There is not the like reason of Predestination, which is only a decreeing of what God will do for us; but God justifieth (as you say) *pro præsenti*; and whom he once justifieth, he will always justifie; else the Apostle would not say, *Whom he justified, them he also glorified*, Rom. 8. 30. Though Means must be used, and Conditions performed for the continuation and consummation of our Justification; yet it being certain that the Means shall be used, and the Conditions performed, it is also certain that our Justification shall be continued and consummated.

Here perhaps you may take hold of what I say, and object, It shall be consummated; therefore as yet it is not consummated.

Answ. It is not (I grant) in respect of the full enjoyment of the Benefits belonging to Justified Persons: but it is already consummated; * so that they have a full right to the enjoyment of those Benefits. Therefore the Apostle speaks as of a thing already done, *Whom he justified, them he also glorified*: see also *Rom.* 5. 1, 2.

* *Justificatio nullum locū relinquit condemnationi.* Joh. 5. 24. *Et vitam æternam certò & immediatè adjudicat.* Ames. *Medul. lib.* 1. *cap.* 27. §. 23.

Ad 5. If by this, [*the solemnizing of all is wanting*] you mean, That yet there wants the manifestation of our Justification, it hinders not but that our Justification is already perfect, though it be not so perfectly made manifest as hereafter it shall be. So if by [*Marriage not solemnized*] you mean a Marriage not publickly celebrated, I see not but that a Marriage privately celebrated may be in it self as perfect as the other. But it seems strange, that you should think, that we should scarce be called Justified

ed now, but in reference to Justification at the last Judgment; when-as both Scripture and Divines usually speak of Justification as a thing that we are here actually partakers of. What you say of Mr. *Lawson*, as if he held, That Justification here is but a right to Justification hereafter, I much wonder at: His Reasons I know not, but if that be his Opinion, the whole current of Scripture, and the general consent of Divines (I think) is against him. Whereas you call the solemn pronouncing of Sentence at the last day, Sentential Justification, I should rather call it, Publick Sentential Justification, or a publick manifestation of the Sentence of Justification. For surely our Justification here is * Sentential. God doth now pronounce and sentence Believers Just and Righteous, though not in that clear and evident manner as he will at the Last Judgment. Neither do I think that our Divines commonly using the word [*Justification*] for Justification (as you say) by Sentence, do understand it of the Sentence at the last Day, but of the Sentence whereby God doth now justifie those that believe.

* See the *Oxford* account, *p.* 7. and *Amef. Med. lib.* 1. *cap.* 27.

Perhaps you will say, Where is that Sentence?

Answ. It is in the Scripture. But (you may say) The Scripture speaks only in general. Well, but if God in the Scripture say, That *all that believe are justified*, as *Acts* 13. 39. then consequently he saith, That you and I believing, are justified. And this Sentence God by his Spirit doth bring home to Believers in particular; though it is true, they have not that clear evidence and full assurance, as they shall have hereafter. So for Condemnation at the last day, I think it to be but a more solemn and publick pronouncing of the Sentence, together with the immediate and full execution of it. For otherwise the Sentence is past already, *He that believeth not, is condemned already*, John 3. 18. I do not deny, that Declarative Justification at the last Judgment, is properly Justification; only I think it is the same Justification which Believers here have, though it shall then be more fully manifested than now it is. That which you speak of Justification being more full at death than before, only shews that it is more full *Extensivè*, as freeing from the guilt of more sins: but that is only *per accidens*; Justification in it self considered, was as perfect before: for it freed from all sin, and from all Condemnation, and the other doth no more.

What

50. What the meaning of your Queſtion was, [*If we be not one real Perſon with Chriſt, then one what?*] I could not tell: but the words did ſeem to imply, That we muſt either be one real Perſon with Chriſt, or elſe we could not any way be one with him; whereas the Scripture is clear, that Believers are one with Chriſt, though that they are one real Perſon with him, is not to be admitted. Therefore I thought meet to anſwer as I did, *viz.* That we are *one Spirit*, as the Apoſtle expreſſeth it, 1 *Cor.* 6. 17. that is, ſpiritually one with Chriſt, as being partakers of one and the ſame Spirit with him. No doubt but further Queries may ſtill be made: and who is able to clear all Difficulties that do occur in matters of this nature? Yet I ſee not why we ſhould not content our ſelves with thoſe Similitudes and Reſemblances, which the Scripture doth uſe to illuſtrate this Myſtery, as of the *Vine* and *Branches*, Joh. 15. and of the *Head* and *Members*, Epheſ. 5.

Ibid. To your next Section I need ſay no more than this, *Non oportet litigare de verbis, cum de re conſtet.*

Ibid. & 51. I have ſhewed my meaning all along, *viz.* That Chriſt's Satisfaction, and not Faith, is properly that by which we are juſtified. Whereas you ſay, [*We are juſtified by Faith it ſelf, as the Condition, and not ſo by Chriſt*] I can admit it only thus, That Faith is the Condition required of us, that ſo we may be juſtified by Chriſt. Otherwiſe I cannot yeeld, that the performing of the Condition required of us unto Juſtification, is properly that by which we are juſtified; but of that enough before. For the Habit and Act of Faith, I little doubt but that Habits and Acts are of a different nature. For Habits may be in us when we ſleep, or otherwiſe do not act and exerciſe thoſe Habits. I think alſo, that though acquired Habits follow Acts, yet infuſed Habits (ſuch as Faith is) go before.

2. The Act of Faith being the receiving of Chriſt, I ſee not how any can make the Act of Faith, but the Habit to be the Inſtrument of receiving Chriſt. And if any of our Divines ſay, That it is not the Habit of Faith, but the Act that doth juſtifie; I think they mean, that Faith doth juſtifie as acting, *i. e.* receiving Chriſt. So that they do not deny the Habit of Faith to juſtifie, yea, they make it the inſtrumental cauſe of Juſtification; only they make

make the Act of Faith requisite unto Justification. The Similitude betwixt the Hand and Faith is to the purpose, though they differ as you say. No Similitude is to be set on the Rack: if it seem to illustrate that for which it is used, it is sufficient. But except you speak of the supernatural perfection of the Soul, I see not how Faith is the perfection of it. For the Soul hath its natural perfection without Faith, or any other Habit. Whereas you labour much to prove, that the Habit of Faith is not properly an Instrument, I think you trouble your self to no purpose, though (I know) you have some end in it. But what if it be not an Instrument properly, if yet it may not unfitly be so termed? And for any thing I see, it may, even as generally Divines do so term it.

Fides (saith *Rivet*) *est velut organum; & manus animæ, quâ beneficia oblata acceptantur.* And again, *Videndum est quodnam sit animæ organum hanc remissionem apprehendens — Id fidei exclusivè tribuendum*, &c. *Disp. de Fide Just. §. 17, 18.*

So *Trelcatius Jun. Ex parte hominis, Justificationis passiva causa efficiens est ac dicitur reductivè, tota est Instrumentalis, & Fides est*, &c. *Instit. lib. 2 de Justif.*

Thus also *Calvin*, *Fides Instrumentum est duntaxat percipiendæ justitiæ.* Inst. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 11. §. 7.

And *Wotton*, *Ex efficientibus Justificationis causis reliqua est Fides, quam Instrumenti locum obtinere diximus.* And again, *Nec illud quidem cujusquam est momenti, quod Instrumenti nomine nusquam in Scripturis (Fides) insigniatur. Nam nec Causa esse dicitur, cujus tamen rationem obtinere, Theologi omnes confitentur.* *De Recon. p.1.l.2.c.18 Ibid. p.2. l. 2. c. 6.*

And *Bellarmine* saying, that *Luther* makes Faith *Formalem causam Justificationis*; *Davenant* answers, *Instrumentalem semper agnovit, non autem formalem*, &c. *De Just. Habit. cap. 22.*

Pemble saith, [*Faith doth justifie Relatively and Instrumentally*]. Of Justif. §. 2 *chap.* 1. *p.* 27.

So Mr. *Ball* of Faith, *chap.* 10. *pag.* 135. [*It is a cause only Instrumental*, &c.]

And of the Covenant, *chap.* 3. *p.* 19. [*Faith is a necessary and lively Instrument of Justification*, &c. *If it be demanded whose Instrument it is? It is the Instrument of the Soul*, &c.] See *Hemingius* as here cited, *p.* 95.

Mr.

Of the Coven. c. 12. p. 80.

Mr. *Blake's* words (I think) do more nearly concern you. [*And these things considered, I am truly sorry, that Faith should now be denied to have the office and place of an Instrument in our Justification; nay, scarce be allowed to be called the Instrument of receiving Christ that justifies us*, &c.] And having cited *Acts* 18. 26. *Ephes.* 3. 17. & *Gal.* 3. 14. he saith, [*These Scriptures speak of Faith as the Souls Instrument to receive Christ Jesus*, &c.] See there much more to this purpose.

Ibid. pag. 81.

Of Justif. c. 7. p. 90.

I will add to these one more, *viz. J. Goodwin*, who though in divers things he be cross and contrary to our Divines, yet in this, at least in words, he doth comply with them, professing to hold, That *Faith doth justifie instrumentally*.

If the propriety of Words must always be strictly examined, we shall scarce know how to speak: It is well if we can find words, whereby to express our selves so as that others may understand (if they please) what we mean. All that our Divines mean, when they speak of Faith justifying Instrumentally, or as an Instrument, I suppose, is this, and so much also they usually express, That Faith doth not justifie absolutely, or in respect of it self, but Relatively in respect of its Object, Christ and his Righteousness laid hold on and received by Faith. Neither should you (me-thinks) strive about the word [*Receiving*] how it should be the Act of Faith. It sufficeth, That the Scripture makes Believing in Christ, and Receiving of Christ, one and the same, *John* 1. 12. That which you say of our most famous Writers ordinarily laying the main stress of the Reformed Cause and Doctrine on a plain Error, did deserve to have been either further manifested, or quite concealed; to me it seems very injurious both to our most famous Writers, and also to the Reformed Cause and Doctrine.

52. My meaning is, That Faith justifieth, as it apprehendeth and receiveth Christ, whom the Gospel doth give for Righteousness to such as receive him, *i. e.* believe in him. And thus our Divines frequently express themselves.

Luther, *Fides justificat, quia apprehendit, & possidet illum thesaurum, scil. Christum presentem. Loc. Com. Classf.* 2. *loc.* 19. *ex tom.* 4. And again, *Fides non tanquam opus justificat, sed ideò justificat, quia apprehendit mi-*

misericordiam in Christo exhibitam. Ibid. ex tom. 1. in Gen.

So *Calvin*, *Quod objicit* (*nempe* Osiander) *vim justificandi non ineſſe fidei ex ſeipſâ, ſed quatenus Chriſtum recipit, libenter admitto. —Fides inſtrumentum eſt duntaxat percipiendæ juſtitiæ.* *Inſt. lib. 3. cap. 11. §. 7*

Thus alſo *Hemingius*, *Juſtificamur autem fide, non quod fides ea res ſit, quâ juſti ſumus, ſed quia eſt Inſtrumentum, quo Chriſtum apprehendimus, & complectimur.* *De Juſtif. pag. mihi 141.*

Davenant, *Hoc neceſſariò intelligendum eſt, quatenus ſuum objectum apprehendit, & credenti applicat, nempe Chriſtum cum ſalutiferâ ejus juſtitiâ.* And again, *Quî igitur Fides apprehendit, & applicat nobis Chriſti juſtitiam? id fidei ipſi tribuitur, quod reapſe Chriſto debetur.* *De Juſt. Hab. cap. 28. Arg. & Ibid.*

Ameſ. *Dolor ac deteſtatio peccati non poteſt eſſe cauſa juſtificans, quia non habet (N. B.) vim applicandi nobis juſtitiam Chriſti.* And again, *Apprehenſio juſtificationis per veram fiduciam, non eſt ſimpliciter per modum objecti, ſed per modum objecti (N. B.) nobis donati. Quod enim Deus donaverit fidelibus Chriſtum, & omnia cum eo, Scriptura diſertis verbis teſtatur,* Rom. 8. 32. *Hic tamen obſervandum eſt, accuratè loquendo, apprehenſionem Chriſti & juſtitiæ ejus, eſſe fidem juſtificantem, quia juſtificatio noſtra exurgit ex apprehenſione Chriſti, & apprehenſio juſtificationis, ut poſſeſſionis noſtræ præſentis, fructus eſt, & effectum apprehenſionis prioris.* *Contra Bell. Tom. 4. lib. 5. c. 4 §. 5. Ibid. §. 11.*

Pemble, [*We deny that Faith juſtifies us as it is a Work*, &c. *It juſtifies us only as the Condition required of us, and an Inſtrument of embracing Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; nor can the contrary be proved*]. Of Juſtif. §. 2. *ch.* 3. *pag.* 61.

Mr. *Ball*, [*When Juſtification and Life is ſaid to be by Faith, it is manifeſtly ſignified, That Faith receiving the Promiſe, doth receive Righteouſneſs and Life freely promiſed*]. Of the Coven. *chap.* 3. *pag.* 19.

Mr. *Blake*, [*Faith as an Inſtrument receives Righteouſneſs unto Juſtification*]. Of the Coven. *chap.* 12. *pag.* 82.

If you agree with me (as you ſay) in this particular, you will agree alſo with theſe whom I have cited, for I agree with them; their meaning and mine (ſo far as I can

can discern) is the same. See also Mr. *Ball* of Faith, *Part* 1. *chap.* 10. *pag.* 135.

Ibid. For the Twofold Righteousness, which you make necessary unto Justification, I think also I have said enough before. But seeing that in the place, on which I made the *Animadversion*, you mention it as a Reason why Faith must justifie in a proper sense, and not Christ's Righteousness only, I cannot but observe how that acute and learned Man Mr. *Pemble* doth argue the quite contrary way, *viz.* That Faith doth not justifie, as taken properly, because then we should be justified by a Two-fold Righteousness. [*We are not justified* (faith he) *by two Righteousnesses existing in two divers Subjects*; *But if we be justified by the Work of Faith, we shall be justified partly by that Righteousness which is in us*, viz. *of Faith, and partly by the Righteousness of Christ without us*].

Of Justif. §. 2. cap. 2. pag. 39.

Ibid. pag. 40. And again, [*We cannot be properly justified by both, for our own Faith, and Christ's obedience too. For if we be perfectly just in God's sight for our own Faith, what needs the imputation of Christ's Obedience to make us just? If for Christ's Righteousness we be perfectly justified, How can God account us perfectly just for our Faith?*]

Ibid. & 53. 1. If you do not oppose the Literal sense of Scripture to Figurative, I do not oppose you, but grant that Faith doth justifie figuratively, *viz.* as apprehending Christ by whom we are justified.

Ubi supra. [*In these places* (saith *Pemble*) *where it is said, Faith is imputed for Righteousness, the Phrase is to be expounded* Metonymice, i. e. *Christ's Righteousness believed on by Faith, is imputed to the Believer for Righteousness*].

A figurative sense may be a plain sense, yet it is not a proper sense; for surely Figurative and Proper are opposite one to the other.

In Gen. Exer. 73. *Distinguendum est* (*inquit* Rivetus) *inter has phrases, quæ etsi in unum sensum conveniunt, differunt nihilominùs in eo, quòd una est figurata, altera propria. Figurata est, Fides imputatur ad justitiam. Propria est, Justitia imputatur credenti. Tum enim justitiæ nomen ponitur directè pro eâ justitiâ, cujus intuitu Deus erga nos placatus est, & pro justis habet. In primo autem Fidei tribuitur, quod ejus non est propriè sumpta. Nec enim*

enim eſt juſtitia, nec juſtitia loco habetur, ſed objectum ejus eſt juſtitia vera, quæ per fidem nobis imputatur, ut pro noſtra habeatur, quam credendo amplexi ſumus. Hæc ſi capere nolint aut veteratores Romani, *aut Novatores* Sociniani, *ſufficiat nobis Apoſtolos autores habere, qui operibus noſtris, ergò fidei quâ opus, omnem juſtitiæ laudem detrahunt, eamque in juſtitiâ, quæ ſine operibus nobis imputatur, conſtituunt.* That the ſenſe by me and others put on Scripture is forced, you affirm, but prove not.

2. I acknowledg but one Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified, *viz.* the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt through Faith imputed unto us; ſee *Rom.* 5. 18. Your Similitude makes againſt you. For our Hands and Teeth are but Inſtruments whereby we are fed: ſo our Faith is but an Inſtrument whereby we are juſtified. And mark here, how you can uſe the Compariſon your ſelf, which yet you diſlike when others uſe it. But doth the Scripture no where ſay, That Chriſt or his Righteouſneſs is imputed unto us for Righteouſneſs? Doth not the Scripture call Chriſt *our Righteouſneſs*? Jer. 23. 6. Doth it not ſay, That *Chriſt is the end of the Law for Righteouſneſs to every one that believeth*? Rom. 10. 4. Is not this as much as if it were ſaid, That Chriſt or his Righteouſneſs is imputed unto us for Righteouſneſs? See alſo *Rom.* 5. 18, 19. and 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult.*

What Mr. *Gataker* ſaith concerning this Point, not having the Book which I ſuppoſe you mean, (his *Defence of Wotton*) I cannot tell: What *Wotton* and *J. Goodwin* ſay, I ſee, but am not ſatisfied with it. *Maccovius de Juſtif.* in divers Diſputations doth profeſſedly oppoſe *Wotton*, and anſwers his Objections. If you had urged any of his, or the others Arguments, I ſhould have taken them into conſideration; but ſeeing you do not, it is enough (I think) to oppoſe their Authority, with the Authority of others no way inferiour unto them.

Davenant, *Scriptura, quæ aſſerunt ipſam fidem nobis imputari ad juſtitiam, apertè indicant Chriſti juſtitiam credentibus imputari. Nam fides, qualitas in ſe conſiderata, non poteſt magis imputari ad juſtitiam, quàm alia qualitates ab eodem Spiritu infuſæ: ſed hoc neceſſariò intelligendum eſt, quatenus ſuum objectum apprehendit, & credenti applicat, nempe Chriſtum cum ſalutiferâ* De Juſt. Habit. cap. 28. Arg. 8.

ejus

ejus justitiâ. Among other Scriptures which he cites to this purpose, that is one, which you ſtand ſo much upon, [Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs*]. *Ex hiſce (inquit) nos colligimus, imputari credentibus Chriſti juſtitiam, quando illam verâ fide apprehendunt.*

And *Bellarmine* objecting, *Ipſa fides imputatur ad juſtitiam: fides autem non eſt imputata Chriſti juſtitia, ſed qualitas in nobis inhærens.* He anſwers, *Frivola eſt Objectio: nam nihil uſitatius, quàm cauſæ applicanti illud tribuere, quod propriè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Quia igitur fides apprehendit & applicat nobis juſtitiam Chriſti; id fidei ipſi tribuitur, quod reapſe Chriſto debetur.*

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. Lib. 6. cap. 1.

So *Ames.* anſwering the very ſame words of *Bellarmine*, ſaith, *Fides imputatur ad juſtitiam*, Rom. 4. 5. *idem eſt cum eo quod dicitur*, v. 6. *Deus imputat juſtitiam abſque operibus*; & *remittit peccata*, v. 7. *Fides autem ipſa abſolutè conſiderata, neque eſt juſtitia ſine opere, neque remiſſio peccatorum: neceſſe eſt igitur, ut fides imputata relativè involvat ſuum objectum, id eſt, Chriſtum fide apprehenſum.*

Loc. com. de Juſtif. Loc. 31. Quæſt. 35.

Bucan. *Quomodo igitur fides dicitur in juſtitiam imputari? Non abſolutè, ſed relativè, &c.* And having cited *Rom.* 3. 22, 25. he ſaith, *Quibus locis Fidei voce (metonymiâ continentis pro re contentâ) Chriſtus crucifixus intelligitur, ſed fide apprehenſus. Hoc ſenſu fides* Abrahæ *imputata eſt ei ad juſtitiam, ſeu pro juſtitiâ*, Rom. 4. 9. *Et fides cuilibet credenti imputatur ad juſtitiam, i. e. Chriſtus crucifixus apprehenſus fide cenſetur noſtra juſtitia; cenſetur, inquam, à Deo è tribunali ſuo ſententiam juſtitiæ pronunciante. Quemadmodum igitur manus, quæ recipit theſaurum donatum, non ditat, ſed theſaurus: ſic nec fidei opus, vel actio nos juſtificat, ſed ipſe Chriſtus, quem fide apprehendimus. Et hoc eſt, quod Theologi Orthodoxi dicunt, nos juſtificari fide correlativè, & ratione Objecti fidem imputari in juſtitiam. Quæ aſſertio inde manifeſta eſt, quod apud* Paulum, *Rom.* 3. 27, 28. *opponitur hæc enuntiatio, Fide ſumus juſti, propoſitioni huic, Juſtificamur ex operibus, tanquam contradictoriæ. Quanè ex naturâ contradictionis perſpicuum eſt, non juſtificari quemquam Fide in quantum*

tum est opus sive nostrum, sive Dei in nobis, sed in quantum Christi meritum includit.

Rivet; *Fides excludit seipsam, quâ opus est. Unum enim opus non justificat, nec quidem potest justificare. Redeundum ergo ad Controversia statum, quo Fides statuitur justificare, non quatenus est opus, sive per se, sed relativè, quatenus significat applicationem justitiæ Christi, i. e. non nostræ, sed alienæ.* The same Author also saith thus, *Apostolus non distinguit inter Opera Legis, & Opera Fidei, sed in hoc negotio Fidem semper quibuslibet operibus opponit. Unde etiam sequitur fidem non justificare, quatenus est opus justitiæ, sed quatenus apprehendit justitiam Christi.* *In Gen. Exer. 73. Disput. De Fide Justif. §. 19.*

That we are justified by Faith, is without controversie, the Scripture being express for it: but when you say, That Faith properly taken doth justifie, which the Scripture saith not, in this I dissent from you. And also because you make Faith one Righteousness, by which we are justified, as indeed you must, if properly we be justified by it.

Davenant urgeth from *Rom.* 5. 18. That there is *unum tantùm δικαίωμα, quod ad justificationem vitæ potest valere, nempe unius Christi obedientia.* Whence he infers, *Justificatio igitur vitæ non redundat in nos ab ullâ qualitate in nobismet ipsis inhærente, sed ab hâc justitiâ completâ Mediatoris nobis donatâ & imputatâ. Nostra justitia inhærens non habet in se δικαίωμα, hoc est, perfectionem justitiæ completam, & absolutam. Ergo non potest producere in nobis δικαίωσιν ζωῆς, &c.* *Ubi supra Arg. 11.*

You mistake my Argument, and do not mind the Text which I alledged, *viz.* Acts 13. 39. *By him all that believe are justified,* &c. Therefore not only all that believe in Christ are justified, but it is by him that they are justified, *i. e.* by his Obedience, as it is expressed *Rom.* 5. 19. So that Christ's Obedience is that which is properly imputed for Righteousness, though it be so imputed only to those that believe; Faith to apprehend it, is required of us, that it may be imputed to us; and in that respect Faith is said to be imputed for Righteousness.

1. The first Note seems to shew thus much, That some may make Faith an Instrument of Justification, and yet deny that we are properly justified by it as by an Instru-

ment: Though if this be granted, I see not what you gain by it. For (as I said in the *Animadversion*) they that make Faith an Instrument of Justification, when they deny that we are properly justified by Faith; they mean, That Faith is not the * Righteousness by which we are justified; and that we are therefore only said to be justified by Faith, because by Faith we receive the Righteousness of Christ, by which Righteousness properly we are justified. That this is the meaning of our Divines, appears by that which I have before alledged.

* *Non est justitia, nec justitiæ loco habetur, &c. Rivet* before cited.

2. Therefore who those be, of whom you speak, I do not know: However, I do not see that your Objections are of force. For Faith is not wholly excluded as to the Text, though it be so interpreted, as that by [Faith imputed] is meant Christ and his Righteousness, *viz.* * as apprehended by Faith; and I presume that they whom you tax, did so understand it. And this doth not exclude Faith, but include it. Your Question therefore seems captious, [*If by Faith be meant Christ's Righteousness, then what word doth signifie Faith?*] For by Faith is not simply meant Christ's Righteousness, but as it is apprehended by Faith.

* See *Bucan* before cited.

3. *Davenant*'s words, which I cited, are clearly to the purpose to which I cited them; neither do I see any thing in them, which argue him to have been of another mind than I am of. Whereas you add, [*It seems he discerned the mistake of them, that affirm Christ's Active Righteousness as such to be our Righteousness*]. I think your Scribe did mistake, and it should be, [he discerned not]. For therein indeed, in that Chapter, but not in the words which I cited, he differs both from you and me: But I was willing to let that pass, both because it is nothing to our present purpose; and also I like not to shew my dissent from any eminent Writer, except I be forced to it.

4. What you say you will alledge out of *Davenant* against me, is to be considered when it is alledged. But here you profess your self far from approving what he saith, *viz.* That Christ's Righteousness *est formalis causa justificationis ex communi nostrorum sententia*; You should say, Christ's Righteousness imputed to us: for so *Davenant* hath it in the words which I cited. And you should also consider how immediately before those words

words he explained himſelf about the *formalis cauſa juſtificationis.*

For *Bellarmine* objecting, That though *Chriſti obedientia ſit meritoria cauſa juſtificationis noſtræ, propter quam Deus nos juſtificat*, yet *Juſtitia inhærens poteſt eſſe formalis, per quam juſtificati conſtituimur*; and taxing *Chemnitius* for ſtating the queſtion thus, *Quid ſit id, propter quod Deus hominem in gratiam recipiat*, &c. He anſwers, *Sed immemorem ſe hîc præbet Jeſuita, qui eodem modo & ipſe loquitur de Juſt. lib. 2. cap. 1.* [*De Cauſâ formali, propter quam homo dicitur juſtus coram Deo, diſſerendum eſt*]. *Atque reverâ in Juſtificatione talis cauſa formalis ponenda eſt, quæ ſimul & meritoria eſſe poſſit. Niſi enim illam contineat dignitatem in ſe, propter quam homo ritè juſtificatus reputetur, nunquam erit formalis cauſa, per quam juſtificatus exiſtat in conſpectu Dei.* De Juſt. Habit. cap. 22.

And again, *Ut itaque ſeponamus Philoſophicas Speculationes de naturâ cauſæ formalis, quando formalem cauſam quærimus juſtificationis noſtræ, quærimus propter quod peccator in gratiam Dei recipitur, per quod immediatè Deo gratus, & ad vitam æternam acceptus ſtat, cujus beneficio damnatoriam Legis ſententiam evadere, denique quo imò poſſit, & debeat ad cœleſtis Judicis favorem & approbationem conſequendam.* Ibid.

And again, *Quod igitur dicit* Bellarminus, *impoſſibile eſſe, ut per juſtitiam Chriſti imputatam formaliter juſti ſimus, ſi per formaliter intelligat inhærenter, nugas agit*, &c. *Si autem per formalem cauſam intelligat illud ipſum, quod Deus intuetur quando quemvis peccatorem juſtificat*, &c. *dico hoc non eſſe inhærentem ullam qualitatem, ſed Chriſti obedientiam & juſtitiam credentibus gratuitâ Dei miſericordiâ donatam atque imputatam. Impoſſibile quidem eſt, ut hæc juſtitia, quæ in Chriſto inhæret, ſit etiam noſtra per modum inhæſionis; ſed quando tanquam membra unimur Chriſto capiti, non eſt impoſſibile, ut noſtra fiat per modum donationis, & ſalutifera participationis: atque hic modus ſufficit, ut in Juſtificatione formalis cauſæ rationem, efficaciam, & ſimilitudinem obtineat.* Ibid. cap. 24. ad 5.

Me-thinks all this ſhould ſuffice to ſatisfie any ingenuous Man, and to cut off all occaſion of quarrelling about

the term, when there is so full and frequent explication of the meaning of it.

Contra Bellar. tom. 4. l. 6. c. 1. §. 1. So also *Amesius* having out of *Contarenus* distinguished of Righteousness, and stated the Question about the formal cause of Justification, he saith, *Hoc sensu nos negamus formalem causam absolutæ (N. B.) nostræ justificationis esse justitiam in nobis inhærentem.*

Ibid. §. 22. And again, *Non aliâ ratione formaliter nos justos nominari, & esse dicimus imputatâ Christi justitiâ, quam quâ is cujus debitum ab altero solvitur nominatur & est ab illo debito liber & immunis; & quâ is cui procuratus est alterius favor aut gratia, nominatur & est alteri gratus.* For that which you cite out of his *Med. l. 1. c. 27. §. 12.* I find there only these words, *Christi igitur justitia in justificatione fidelibus imputatur*, Phil. 3. 9. *Edit. 3. per Rob. Allotum Londini, 1629.* Those which you add are not in my Edition, *viz. Quatenus ejus merito justi coram Deo reputamur.*

However they are not repugnant to what I have cited, both from him and *Davenant*, because (as *Davenant* expresly notes) *Causa formalis hîc etiam est meritoria.* *Alsted*'s words, as you cite them, [*Christus est justitia nostra in sensu causali, non in sensu formali*] carry no good sense, at least are not so accurate. For surely if *Formalis Causa*, then *Sensus Formalis* is also *Sensus Causalis.*

You add, [So *Rivet Disp. de Fide.*] but you should also have noted the Section. Indeed §. 13. he saith, That *Bellarmine* doth *affingere nobis sententiam de justitia Christi, tanquam causâ formali.* And elsewhere *Colledg. Controver. Disp. 34.* he saith, *Forma justificationis consistit in justitia Christi imputatione, propter quam nobis remittuntur peccata.*

Instit. lib. 2. So *Treleatius*, *Forma justificationis, Activè sumpta, est Actualis Justitia Christi gratuita imputatio, qua meritum & obedientia Christi nobis applicantur, vi communionis artissima, quâ ille in nobis, & nos in illo.*

Of Justifying Faith *Sect. 2. chap. 18.* Dr. *Jackson* saith, That *to demand what is the formal cause of Justification, is as if one should ask what is the Latin for* Manus: *and that it is the folly or knavery of our Adversaries to demand a formal Cause of their Justification, who deny themselves to be formally just in the sight of God.* [*He alone* (saith he) *is formally just, who hath that form inherent in himself, by which he*

he is denominated juſt, and ſo accepted of God: as Philoſophers deny the Sun to be formally hot, becauſe it hath no form of heat inherent in it, but only produceth heat in other Bodies].

Thus there is difference among our Divines about the term, but they agree in the thing. Some would have no formal Cauſe of Juſtification at all; ſome would have ſuch a Cauſe, but would not have Chriſt's Righteouſneſs imputed, but the imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to be it: yet both the one and the other do indeed hold the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to be the formal Cauſe of Juſtification, in that ſenſe as *Davenant* and *Ames* do explain it.

1. As Faith alone is the Condition of our Juſtification, ſo alſo Faith alone as continued (though it is not continued alone) is the Condition of our Continued Juſtification. 54.

Neque etiam (ſaith *Calvin*) *ſic putemus commendari poſt gratuitam juſtificationem opera, ut & ipſa in locum juſtificandi hominis poſtea ſuccedant, aut ejuſmodi officium cum Fide* (*N. B.*) *partiantur. Niſi quum perpetuò maneat ſolida Fides juſtificatio, illorum immunditiæ detegetur. Nihil autem abſonum eſt, ſic Fide hominem juſtificari, ut non ipſe modò juſtus ſit ſed opera quoque ejus ſupra dignitatem juſta cenſeantur.* *Inſtit. lib. 3. cap. 17. § 9.*

So Mr. *Ball*, [*Faith doth not begin to apprehend Life, and then leave it to works, that we might attain the accompliſhment by them, but it doth ever reſt upon the Promiſe until we come to enjoy it*]. Of Faith, Part 2. Chap. 4. p. 252, 253

2. I know no accuſation but of the Law of Works, though in caſe of unbelief and impenitency that Accuſation be aggravated by the Law of Grace.

Though *Calvin* thinks not that *Joh.* 5. 45. [*Do not think that I will accuſe you to my Father; there is one that accuſeth you, even* Moſes, *&c.*] to be to this purpoſe, as ſome do; yet he grants, That it is *Legis proprie reos peragere infideles.* *Calvin* in *Joh.* 5. 45.

To queſtion whether he ſpake of the Law of Works, were to queſtion whether the Sun ſhineth at noon-day. When any is accuſed to be an Infidel, or finally impenitent, or a ſinner againſt the Holy Ghoſt, as it is a ſin that he is accuſed of, ſo the Accuſation is from the Law: but as Unbelief or Impenitency (for why you bring in the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, I do not know) doth import

a want of the Condition required in the Gospel, so (as I have said before) it is no new accusation, but only a re-inforcing of a former accusation; and so the refelling of this Accusation, by shewing the fruits of Faith and Repentance, is not properly a justifying of our selves by any thing in our selves, but only a proving and manifesting that we are indeed justified by the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us.

3. The imperfection of our Faith and Obedience doth prove that it is no Righteousness by which we can be justified; consider always, that I speak of absolute and universal Justification.

Instit. lib. 3. c. 11. §. 7. *Si per se* (saith *Calvin*) *vel intrinsecâ, ut loquuntur, virtute justificaret fides, ut est semper debilis & imperfecta, non efficeret hoc nisi ex parte; sic manca esset justitia, quæ frustulum salutis nobis conferret.*

De Instit. Habit. cap. 26. Arg. 3. Ibid. Arg. 4. So *Davenant*, *Ad justificationem efficiendam non sufficit justitia suo quodam modo perfecta, & aliquo modo imperfecta; sed necesse est eam esse legali modo perfectam, & omnibus suis numeris absolutam.* And again, *Nulla justitia coram Deo justificat, sed quæ ad amussim Legis perfecta est: Sed nostra inhærens non est talis, &c.*

De Justif. Disp. 11. Thus also *Maccovius*, *Quod nobis imputatur ad justitiam, (nempe propriè & per se, seu respectu sui) id debet esse perfectissimum, ut consistere possit cum judicio Dei*, Rom. 2. 2. *At Fides non est perfectissima*, 1 Cor. 13. 9.

Ibid. To me it seems not hard to be certain of the meaning of that place, *Luke* 7. 47. [*Many sins are forgiven her, for she loved much*]. It appears (as I noted) plainly enough by the Context, what the meaning is, *viz.* not that her love was the cause of the forgiveness of her sins, but the forgiveness of her sins the cause of her love: And you see how sharply *Calvin* (whose words I cited) censures those that interpret it otherwise.

In Luc. 7. 42. The Parable going before those words are so clear, That *Maldonate* is forced to say, *Videtur ex hâc parabolâ non fuisse colligendum, quod Christus colligit, multa peccata illi mulieri remitti, quia multum dilexisset, sed contrà propterea eam multum dilexisse, quòd multa illi peccata remissa essent.—Qua res speciosam* Calvino, *& cæteris hæreticis, errandi occasionem præbuit, negantibus huic mulieri propter præcedentia charitatis opera remissa peccata;*

peccata; illa verò verba, quoniam dilexit multum, ſic interpretamibus, ut dictio illa quoniam, non cauſam, ſed effectum, & conſequentiam ſignificet: quod utinam nemo Catholicorum ſecutus eſſet.

And ſee how poorly and pittifully he comes off, *viz.* either thus, *Ut Chriſtum inverſâ parabolâ uſum fuiſſe decerenmus. q. d. Sicut ille dilexit multum, quia multum illi remiſſum fuerat; ita huic mulieri è contrario, quia dilexit multum, remiſſa ſunt peccata multa.* Or, which he rather inclines unto, thus, *Quod Chriſtum hoc loco rogat, Quis ergo eum plus diliget eiſi futurum tempus eſt, tamen ex conſuetudine loquendi vim præteriti habere puto. q. d. Quem tu judicas, ex effectu conjecturam faciens, plus antè Dominum ſuum dilexiſſe? Utrum illi magis amicum fuiſſe, cum amicitiæ cauſâ fenerator debitum utrique remiſerit?* What ſtraits was this acute Man driven to, becauſe he was reſolved to hold the Concluſion, and yet ſaw how ill it did ſuit with the Premiſes?

1. What others, of whom you ſpeak do, I know not; they may anſwer for themſelves. *Ibid.*

2. I take affiance (which is a Believing in, or Relying on) to be an Act of Faith it ſelf, the Act of Faith being as well *Credere in*, as *ſimpliciter Credere*. But internal Obedience or Love, (for theſe you make both one, though indeed Believing it ſelf is inward Obedience as well as Love, the one being commanded as well as the other) is not the Act of Faith, though cauſed by Faith; not *actus elicitus*, though *actus imperatus*: therefore this is not ſo immediate a product of Faith as the other.

3. I conceive Affiance to be a part of Juſtifying-Faith, and not only a Fruit of it. *To believe in Chriſt*, which is as much as to rely on him, and to have affiance in him, is requiſite unto Juſtification. *He that believeth on him is not condemned*, John 3. 18.

1. As Juſtification is begun upon ſole Believing, ſo is it alſo continued and conſummated. The Scripture (ſo far as I ſee) makes Juſtification ſimply and abſolutely to depend on Faith, and not only in reſpect of the beginning of it: yet (it is true) Juſtification is neither begun, nor continued, nor conſummated upon ſuch a Believing as is not attended with other Duties. That this is the Uniform Doctrine of the prime Proteſtants, I *Ibid.*

shewed by the confession of our greatest Adversary, to which you oppose nothing?

Multa ad justificationem requiruntur quæ non justificant Amesi. *contra* Bellar. *tom.* 4. *l.* 5. *cap.* 1. §. 1. *De Reconcil.* part 1. *lib.* 2. *c.* 18.

2. Though some other things besides Faith must go before Justification, yet do they not therefore justifie as well as Faith, it being only Faith that doth apprehend Christ, by whom so apprehended we are justified.

Neque tamen hac fides (saith *Wotton*) *spem, dilectionem, timorem, pœnitentiam excludere censenda est, quasi ad eum, qui justificatus est, non pertinerent; sed hæc omnia ab officio justificandi* (*N. B.*) *significantur penitus excludi. Atque hoc quidem justificandi munus soli Fidei convenire, his rationibus ostendo. Quia solâ Fide rectà in Christum tendimus, ut per eum justificemur, & promissiones Dei de justificatione amplectimur. 2. Ubicunque Spiritus Sanctus disertis verbis loquitur de justificatione impii, ejusque causas ex hominis parte assignat, nullam ejusmodi causam assignat nisi fidem.*

Loc. Com. Class. 2. *Loc.* 19. *de Justif. ex Tom.* 2. *in Gen.*

But hear also *Luther*, who doth both thunder and lighten in this particular: *Cur insane Sophista, asseris dilectionem, spem, & alias virtutes? Scio has esse insignia Dei dona, divinitus mandata, per Spiritum Sanctum in nostris cordibus excitari & ali. Scio fidem sine his donis non existere; sed nunc nobis quæstio est, quid cujusque proprium sit. Tenes manu varia semina, non autem quæro ego, quæ cum quibus conjuncta sint, sed quæ cujusque propria virtus. Hic apertè dic quid faciat Sola Fides, non cum quibus virtutibus conjuncta sit. Sola autem Fides apprehendit promissionem, credit promittenti Deo, Deo porrigenti aliquid admovet manum, & id accipit. Hoc proprium solius Fidei est; Charitas, Spes, Patientia habent alias materias, circa quas versantur; habent alios limites, intra quos consistunt. Non enim amplectuntur promissionem, sed mandata exquuntur; audiunt Deum mandantem, non audiunt Deum promittentem, ut Fides facit.*

55. In the next Section we are agreed.

Ibid. To this long Section I need not say much. For now that you explain your self, there seems to be but little difference betwixt us. All that I aim at, is this, That Christ simply considered, is not the Object of Justifying Faith, but Christ as promised in the Gospel: so that to believe in Christ, doth imply a believing of the Promise, and that not only so as to assent unto it, but so also as to

apply

apply it. And therefore we often find in Scripture, That the Axiome or Propoſition concerning Chriſt, is made the Object of Juſtifying and Saving Faith, ſee *Rom.*10.9. 1 *Joh.*5.1. *Acts* 8. 37. *Joh.*6.69. And thus our Divines often ſpeak of Faith juſtifying as apprehending the Promiſes.

Sola Fides (ſaith *Luther*) *apprehendit Promiſſionem.* *Locis paulò ante citatis.*

So *Wotton*; *Solâ Fide Promiſſiones Dei de juſtificatione amplectimur.*

And Mr. *Ball*, [*For Faith only doth behold and receive the Promiſes of Life and Mercy*, &c. *When therefore Juſtification and Life is ſaid to be by Faith, it is manifeſtly ſignified, That Faith receiving the Promiſe, doth receive Righteouſneſs and Life freely promiſed*]. Of the Coven. *ch.*3. *p.*19.

But I willingly grant, That the Axiome, Propoſition or Promiſe doth but ſerve to convey Chriſt unto us, and the apprehending and receiving of him, is the Faith by which we are juſtified. Only I ſay, it is Chriſt in the Promiſe, or Chriſt promiſed, who muſt be apprehended and received unto Juſtification.

Fidei objectum quod (ſaith *Ames.*) *vel materiale*; *eſt quicquid à Deo revelatur ac proponitur credendum*, &c. —— *Hoc objectum eſt immediatè ſemper aliquod axioma vel enuntiatio ſub ratione veri*; *ſed illud, in quo principaliter terminatur Fides, de quo, & propter quod aſſenſus prabetur illis axiomatis per fidem, eſt Ens incomplexum ſub ratione boni*, Rom. 4. 21. Heb.11.13. *Actus enim credentis non terminatur ad axioma, ſed ad rem, ſatentibus Scholaſticorum clariſſimis. Ratio eſt, quia non formamus axiomata, niſi ut per ea de rebus cognitionem habeamus. Principalis igitur terminus, in quem tendit actus credentis, eſt res ipſa, quæ in axiomate præcipuè ſpectatur.* *Medul.l.*1. *c.*5. §. 21. *Ibid.* §.23, 24.

All this I like well enough, ſave that he ſeems to make the Act of Faith exerciſed about an Axiome or Enunciation to be only Aſſent, as to that which is true; whereas ſomtimes it is alſo Apprehenſion and Receiving as of that which is good, though (it's true) this Act of Faith is principally terminated in the thing, which the Axiome or Enunciation doth contain in it.

1. I do not ſay, That the receiving of Chriſt as King is *Fides quæ juſtificat*, though I grant it is *Actus fidei quæ juſtificat*. 56, & 57.

2. I

2. I refer [*quâ*] to [*Justificat*] *q. d.* [Faith which justifieth, doth receive Christ as King; yet this is not the Act of Faith, whereby it justifieth]. Or if you will, thus; Christ as King is the object of Faith, which justifieth, but not of Faith as it justifieth. Indeed Faith, which justifieth hath respect to the whole Word of God, yet only to the Word of Promise concerning Christ, and the Mercy of God in Christ, as it justifieth.

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. Lib. 5. c. 1. §. 1, 2. Ibid. cap. 2. §. 1. Ibid. §. 8.

Non tam quæritur (*inquit* Ames.) *quæ aut quid sit Fides, quæ justificat, quàm quæ sit ratio quâ propriè dicitur justificare.* And presently after follow the words, which I cited in the Animadversions. Again, *Una & eadem* (*inquit*) *Fides est, quâ placemus Deo ad reconciliationem, & jam reconciliati dirigimur & sustemamur ad placendum ipsi in Obedientiâ novâ.* And again, *Fidem illam, quæ justificat, præsupponere, involvere, & inferre concedimus fidem Historiæ, atque etiam* (*in quibusdam olim*) *miraculorum; sed historiæ ac miraculorum fidem sæpè à justificatione separari palam est; Quamvis multa sint exercitia & objecta Fidei, non tamen justificans est, nisi prout respicit misericordiam Dei in Christo. Hinc omnes illi, quorum fides in eo capite* (Heb. 11.) *laudatur, collimabant ad promissionem illam miserecordiæ in Christo.*

3. Where do I say, That the receiving of Christ as King doth justifie, that you ask me in what sense it doth so? I say, Justifying Faith doth receive Christ as King, but not as justifying; or that Faith in that respect doth not justifie.

4. Faith as the Condition of Justification is the receiving of Christ as satisfying for us.

5. If Christ's Satisfaction only be our Righteousness, by which we are justified; and Christ as Priest only made Satisfaction for us, then by receiving Christ as Priest only we are justified. This you might perceive was the meaning of the Argument, though I left out the word [only].

And here also I have Mr. *Blake* agreeing with me, as (I think) in every point, wherein we differ, if he have occasion to treat of it. ‘ [It is true (*saith he*) that ‘ Faith accepts Christ as Lord as well as Saviour: but it ‘ is the acceptation of him as Saviour, not as Lord, that ‘ justifies. Christ rules his People as a King, teacheth ‘ them as a Prophet, but makes atonement for them as a ‘ Priest,

Of the Coven. c. 12. p. 79.

'Prieſt, by giving himſelf in Sacrifice, his Blood for re-
'miſſion of Sins. Theſe muſt be diſtinguiſhed, but not
'divided: Faith hath an eye at all, the Blood of Chriſt,
'the Command of Chriſt, the Doctrine of Chriſt: but
'as it ties and faſtens on his Blood, ſo it juſtifies. *He is*
'*ſet out a propitiation through Faith in his Blood*, Rom.
'3. 24. not through Faith in his Command. It is the
'Blood of Chriſt that cleanſeth from all ſin, and not the
'Sovereignty of Chriſt. Theſe confuſions of the di-
'ſtinct parts of Chriſt's Mediatorſhip, and the ſeveral
'offices of Faith may not be ſuffered. Scripture aſſigns
'each its particular Place and Work. Sovereignty doth
'not cleanſe, nor Blood command us: Faith in his
'Blood, not Faith yeelding to his Sovereignty, doth juſti-
'fie us. There are ſeveral acts of Juſtifying-Faith,
'*Heb.* 11. but thoſe are not acts of Juſtification. It is
'not *Abraham*'s Obedience, *Moſes* Self-denyal, *Gideon*
'or *Sampſon*'s Valour, that was their Juſtification, but
'his Blood, who did enable them in theſe things by his
'Spirit].

Your Similitude is not ſuitable; for a Woman receiving a Man for her Husband, may be enriched or dignified by him, though ſhe never look at him as rich or honourable, but only as her Husband. But we muſt look at Chriſt as a Prieſt, and as making Satisfaction for us, that ſo we may be juſtified by him. For the Scripture doth ſet forth Chriſt unto us in that reſpect for our Juſtification; ſee *Apoc.* 1. 5. *Heb.* 9. 26. 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult.* *Rom.* 8. 34. where thoſe words [*It is Chriſt that died*] ſhew how Chriſt doth juſtifie us, and free us from condemnation, *viz.* by dying, and ſo ſatisfying for our ſins. That which follows of Chriſt's Reſurrection, *&c.* ſeems (as to our Juſtification) but for our more full aſſurance of the benefit of Chriſt's Death, and for the effectual application of his Satisfaction, which he made for us by his Death, that ſo we may be juſtified by him.

6. You grant, that Chriſt, not as King, but as Prieſt, doth juſtifie us meritoriouſly and ſatisfactorily; and that is it which I urge, That Chriſt's Satisfaction, which as Prieſt he made for us, is that whereby, or for which we are juſtified. Now we ſpeak of receiving Chriſt unto Juſtification, therefore we muſt conſider him as ſatisfying for us, and ſo receive him as to that purpoſe, *viz.*

our

our Juſtification; though (I grant) whole Chriſt, or Chriſt in reſpect of all his Offices muſt be received; neither may we think to have him as a Prieſt to ſatisfie for us, except we alſo have him as a Prophet to inſtruct us, and as a King to govern us. So I uſually Preach and Teach.

57. (p. 69.) 1. When you ſay, That I leave the Errour in his Language, but not in his Senſe, your words are ambiguous. For they may import, That I leave, *i. e.* reliquiſh and deſert the Error the one way, but not the other. Or that I leave, *i. e.* let the Error abide and remain in his Language, but not in his Senſe. This I take to be your meaning, for elſe you could not ſay (except ironically, which I do not ſuſpect) that it is a fair Expoſition, and that you like it. I have no reaſon to ſtrive about another's words, eſpecially not knowing how they are brought in: but I think meet to interpret words in the beſt ſenſe that they will bear: neither do I yet ſee but thoſe words which you tax as foully erroneous, may admit that fair interpretation which I made of them.

2. Where *Ames.* hath thoſe words, you do not ſhew: But ſurely he there ſpeaks *de Fide Juſtificante quâ tali.* For otherwiſe he ſhould neither agree with the Truth, nor with himſelf in ſaying, *Chriſtus eſt objectum adæquatum Fidei juſtificantis.* The whole Word of God is the Object of Juſtifying-Faith, though not of Faith as Juſtifying; and ſo much is acknowledged by *Ameſius*, as appears by his words before cited. Neither again doth he ſpeak of Chriſt in all reſpects, but as Chriſt is the Propitiation for our ſins, as is clear by that very place which you now take into conſideration.

Beſides, I find *Ameſius* to have ſuch words as you mention, but withall to add ſuch, as plainly to expreſs what I ſay. *Chriſtus* (*inquit*) *eſt adæquatum objectum Fidei, quatenus* (*N. B.*) *Fides Juſtificat. Fides etiam non aliâ ratione juſtificat, niſi quatenus apprehendit illam juſtitiam,* (*N. B.*) *propter quam juſtificamur.*

Medul. lib. 1. *c.* 27. §. 17.

Ibid. & 58. (p. 70.) 1. The Text (1 *John* 4. 19.) cannot (I think) be rightly underſtood but as I interpreted it. For *v.* 10, 11. the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of God's great love manifeſted unto us, in giving his Son for us. And *v.* 19. he ſhews whence it is that we love God, *viz.* from hence, that God loved us firſt, *i. e.* we apprehending the Love of God to us,

us, answer his love with love again. *Amat non immeritò, qui amatus sine merito*, as *Bernard* speaketh. Yet we must first find and feel the love of God towards us, before we can love him for what he hath done for us.

2. There is more than a bare assenting Act of Faith going before the Love, of which I speak.

3. Embracing, which from *Heb.* 11. 13. I note to be the compleating Act of Justifying-Faith, doth include or presuppose *amorem desiderii*; we can never sincerely embrace Christ, if we do not desire him: but *amor delectationis*, or *complacentiæ* doth follow after embracing, *viz.* when the thing desired is enjoyed. All that you add, holds only in respect of the former kind, not in respect of the latter.

1. There are divers kinds of Love, but I speak of that Love which differs from Desire; and so did you seem to understand it, as I noted from your words, *Aphorism*, p. 267. 58.

2. Whereas you say, [*There is no need of Faith to make it present, before it can be accepted and loved*]; you cannot by Faith mean Assent, for that, you grant, doth go before Love and Acceptance. And if by Faith you mean Acceptance, surely there must be Acceptance, before a thing can be accepted, though in time these go together. But perhaps you only mean, That though Faith as an Assent, must go before in time, and as an Acceptance must go before in Nature, yet not so as to make a thing present. For you add, That God's Offer doth make it present. But though the Offer be present, yet the thing offered is not present, so as the Object of the Love of Complacency must be: for it must be present by way of Enjoyment, but the offer of a thing can only make it to be hoped for; so that the thing, though it be offered, yet until it be accepted, it is absent, because it is not enjoyed. The thing offered must be desirously, and in that respect lovingly accepted; but it must first be accepted, and then loved, so as to joy and delight in it.

3. We look at Christ as enjoyed, when we love him with the Love of Complacency and Delight, of which Love I speak.

Gaudium

Theolog. Natur. Tit. 95. *Gaudium oritur ex hoc,* (saith *Raimundus de Sebunde*) *quod aliqua res scit se habere id, quod habet, & non ex hoc duntaxat, quod habet.*

There must both be the Having of a thing, and also the Knowing that we have it, that we may rejoyce in it.

4. As Assent must go before Acceptance, so must Acceptance go before that Love, of which I speak.

Ibid. 1. I did not say, or think, that you thought so of all Love, *viz.* that it considereth its Object as present or enjoyed; for there is no distinguishing here of these, as I have shewed before; the Object is not present, except it be enjoyed. You grant that *Amor Complacentiæ* doth so consider its Object; and I thought you had meant that kind of Love, because you did distinguish Love from Desire. Therefore I said, [Love as you take it, considereth its Object as present and enjoyed] *viz.* Love as distinguished from Desire. I know not (I confess) what to make of Love, but either a Desire, if the Object be absent, or a Delight, if the Object be present.

2. That which you say concerning Acceptance, Election, and Consent, is nothing to me, who do not enquire whether they be divers acts or no, but only shew that they go before Enjoyment, and so differ from Love, as I take it, *viz.* Love of Complacency, which doth follow Enjoyment.

59. I take the Love of Desire to go before Acceptance, and the Love of Complacency to follow after it. Although *Amare & velle bonum* be one and the same, yet this *velle bonum vel est cum desiderio, si objectum absit, vel cum Complacentiâ, si adsit.*

Part 1. Quæst. 20. Art. 1. * *Nempe prius tempore, non naturâ.* *Aquinas* doth not satisfie me, when he saith, *Nullus desiderat aliquid nisi bonum amatum neque aliquis gaudet nisi de bono amato*; if he mean, that a thing is *amatum prius* * *quàm desideratum.* The very *Desiderare* (I think) is *Amare*, and so is *Gaudere* also; but the one is *Amare quod abest*, the other *Amare quod adest.* So you in the next Section say, [*Desire is Love, and Complacency is Love*].

Ibid. 1. I did not doubt, much less deny that there is *Amor Desiderii*, as well as *Amor Complacentiæ*; only I shewed, that your words there must be meant of the former, in which sense I did not oppose you, but as it is taken in the other

other ſenſe; and ſo you ſeemed to take it before, becauſe you did expreſly diſtinguiſh it from Deſire.

Neither is your ſecond any thing againſt me.

3. The Scripture is not ſo much to be interpreted according to the moſt comprehenſive ſenſe, as according to the moſt proper ſenſe, *viz.* that which doth beſt agree with the Context and other places of Scripture.

Your fourth containeth nothing but a *Sarcaſm* very unworthily uſed of ſuch a worthy Man as *Calvin* was.

1. The places, which you alledg (*John* 16. 27. and 14. 21.) do not prove, that Love, *viz.* our Love is an antecedent Condition of God's Love, and Chriſt's Love to us, ſo that we muſt firſt love God and Chriſt, before we can be reconciled unto God in Chriſt. For becauſe we are reconciled unto God in Chriſt, therefore we love God and Chriſt, 1 *John* 4. 19. The meaning of thoſe other places (as *Calvin* notes) is this, That they that love God, *inſculptum habent in cordibus Paterni ejus amoris teſtimonium*: To which may be added, That God will ſtill manifeſt his Love to them more and more. *Ibid.*

2. Not only Love, but Obedience alſo muſt go before Glorification; but it doth not therefore follow, That they muſt go before Juſtification, as your ſelf hold that Obedience doth not as we are at firſt juſtified. That there is any other Condition of Juſtification at laſt than at firſt, is more than I can find in Scripture.

1. What ſome have anſwered, and what you have read in others I know not; you cite none whoſe Works are extant, but only Mr. *Ball*, and him at large, [*On the Covenant*] but where in that Book you do not ſhew. I find there that he doth uſe the words [*Inſtrument*] and [*Condition*] promiſcuouſly. *Ibid.*

[*The Covenant of Grace* (ſaith he) *exacteth no other thing inherent in us, as a Cauſe* (viz. *inſtrumental*) *of Juſtification, or a Condition* (*N.B.*) *in reſpect of which we are juſtified, but Faith alone*]. This is point-blank againſt that which you ſay of him. And again, [*It is* (ſaith he) *the ſole Inſtrumental or Conditional* (*N.B.*) *Cauſe required on our part to Juſtification*]. Of the Coven. p. 65. *Ibid.*

As I ſhewed before in the *Animadverſions, ad pag.* 243. our Divines ſay, *Fides ſola juſtificat, ſed Fides qua juſtificat, non eſt ſola*: but they mean that Love and Obedience follow as the fruits and effects of Faith.

Thus

Thus *Stapleton* somewhere (I cannot now cite the place) teſtifyeth of them, ſaying, *Omnes ad unum Proteſtantes docent Fidem juſtificantem eſſe vivam, & operantem per charitatem, atque alia bona opera.*

2. I grant, That *Amor Concupiſcentiæ* is prerequiſite; if you will call it ſo, as I ſee not but you may, though *Amor Concupiſcentiæ* is uſually oppoſed to *Amor Amicitiæ*, and ſo you ſpeak of it, *p.* 58. And if you ſpeak not of *Amor Complacentiæ*, then neither do I ſpeak againſt you. For of that do I ſpeak, and had reaſon (I think) to underſtand you as ſpeaking of it, becauſe you ſpake of Love as diſtinct from Deſire. Perhaps you ſpeak of it only in reſpect of its Generical Nature, abſtracting from the conſideration of either Deſire or Complacency, which are the Species of it: but ſurely theſe two taking up the whole nature of Love, that Love which is not the one of theſe, muſt needs be the other. We accept or chuſe a thing, becauſe we firſt Love, *i. e.* deſire it, or (as we uſe to ſay) have a mind to it: and having accepted and choſen it, we further love it, ſo as to delight in it, except our Love turn into Hatred, as *Amnon*'s unchaſt Love did: but the very Accepting or Chuſing of a thing is not (that I ſee) properly a Loving of it.

3. I grant, that all Love doth not preſuppoſe Acceptance, Conſent, &c. the Love of Deſire doth not; but the Love of Complacency doth. This is all that I have deſired, and ſo much you have yeelded.

Ibid. 1. The diſtinction of *Fides quæ*, and *Fides quâ*, as it is frequently uſed by our Learned Writers, ſo it doth hold good notwithſtanding any thing you have ſaid, or (I ſuppoſe) can ſay againſt it.

Diſp. de Fide Juſt. §. 16. *Quamvis hanc controverſiam elevent*, (ſaith *Rivet*, ſpeaking of the Remonſtrants) *nec ciccum (ut loquuntur) interdiunt, an Fides quæ eſt viva, an Fides quâ eſt viva, ad juſtificationem requiratur, & Logicam tantum pugnam eſſe velint, Logica tamen hac pugna realem continet magni momenti. Siquis enim dicat, Chriſtus qui homo eſt infinitus, & Chriſtus quâ homo eſt infinitus, nemo ſanus exiſtimabit nihil differre has enuntiationes.*

I grant you more than you require, That not only Chriſt as Lord, but even the whole Word of God is the Object of Juſtifying Faith; but not therefore of Faith as Juſtifying. The Hand may receive both Meat and Mony, yet

yet it doth not enrich, as it receiveth Meat, nor feed as it receiveth Mony.

2. If Christ's Satisfaction be our Righteousness, (which I think you have ever affirmed, though you would also have another Righteousness of our own, and that unto Justification;) then I see not but that I may speak of Faith laying hold on, and apprehending Christ's Satisfaction. For though the Satisfaction was made unto God, yet it was made for us; and in that respect we are to lay hold on it, and receive it, and not only to assent to the truth of it.

You somewhere cite *Bellarmine* yeelding unto us thus much, *Imputari nobis Christi merita, quia nobis donata sunt, & possumus ea Deo Patri offerre pro peccatis nostris, quoniam Christus suscepit super se onus satisfaciendi pro nobis, nosque Deo Patri reconciliandi.*

Which words also *Amesius* doth cite, and interpret to be as much as if he did say, *Christi merita sunt nobis à Deo donata, ut possimus ea pro nobis Deo offerre tanquam Satisfactionem pro peccatis nostris.* *Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. l. 6. c. 1. §. 22.*

It is *Satisfactio Christi*, though by Faith it becomes *Nostra*, which we must *offerre Deo*: but first we must by Faith receive it, before we can have any interest in it, to make such use of it. Faith justifieth (I grant) as a Condition, because it is required of us, that we may be partakers of Christ's Righteousness; but it is not Faith properly, but the Righteousness of Christ by which we are justified. (p. 72.)

Rectè Contarenus (saith *Ames.*) *in Tract. de Justif. Fide justificamur, non formaliter, sicut Albedo efficit parietem album, aut Sanitas hominem sanum; sed efficienter, sicut Linitio efficit parietem album, & Medicatio efficit sanum: sic, vel non dissimili ratione, Fides efficit hominem justum, & justificat.* *Ubi supra lib. 5. c. 4. §. 12.*

I like your Explication which you now make, and I think my labour well bestowed, as being the occasion of it. I perceive all that you mean is this, That the Covenant wherein God doth give Christ, is not of force to make Christ ours until we believe. This who can question, Christ being given to be ours only upon condition of believing? Yet Christ being so conditionally given in the Covenant, upon our believing he is made ours by vertue of the Covenant: so that still I see not but that our be- *Ibid. & 60.* (p. 73)

lieving doth immediately make Christ ours, there being nothing more to that end required of us, but to believe. But how will it follow, that God doth justifie Men before they believe, when by his Covenant he doth not justifie but upon condition of Believing? The Grant of a thing being Conditional, it cannot be actually obtained until the Condition be performed, though upon the performance of the Condition by vertue of the Grant there be actual enjoyment.

6. (p. 73.) Whether the receiving of Christ as Priest, and the receiving of him as King be two distinct acts, doth little concern our purpose; yet I think the Acts may be distinct, though I deny not but Christ may be received at once in both respects: yet if he be, it is the receiving of him as Priest, not as King, that doth justifie. I grant that the receiving of Christ in respect of any one Office doth virtually include the receiving of him in respect of all his Offices: and he that doth not so receive Christ in respect of his Priestly Office, as to be ready to receive him also in respect of his Kingly Office, when Christ shall so be set forth unto him, doth not at all receive him: such a Faith is a false Faith, and cannot justifie. Yet may there be a receiving of Christ as Priest without an express and direct receiving of him as King, though implicitly and by consequence he be received as such. Neither is it a false Knowledg, though it be an imperfect Knowledg to know Christ as a Priest, and not to know him as a King. And that Christ is sometimes propounded only as a Priest, *i. e.* with express mention only of his Priestly Office, seems clear and undeniable by divers places of Scripture; see *John* 1. 29, 36. and 3. 14, 15. and so other places which speak of Christ as suffering for us, not mentioning his Sovereignty over us, though that is there implied and expressed in other places. And though he be (as sometimes he is) expressly set forth at once both as Priest and King, and so must expressly be received at once in both respects; yet it hinders not, but that the receiving of Christ as Priest, and not the receiving of him as King, is that which justifieth. One may at once receive divers things, and yet those things not all serve for one and the same use, but one thing may serve for one use, and another thing for another use, all being, though in several respects, useful and necessary to be received.

You

You say that you are of my mind in all this, yet you seem to differ from me, in that you make Affiance a Fruit of Acceptance, which you make the very Act of Faith by which we are justified; whereas I taking Affiance for Recumbency, and for that which is meant by Believing in Christ, and Embracing him, make it to be the very Justifying Act of Faith. That Believing in Christ doth principally import Assent I cannot see: to Believe indeed doth seem principally to import Assent; but to Believe in, seems principally to import Affiance. *Ibid.* (74.)

Credere in Christum (as *Ferus* saith well) *est certâ, firmâ, & stabili fiduciâ Christum, omniaque ejus bona complecti, eisque toto corde, totâ animâ, totisque viribus inhærere.* *In Joh. 6. 29.*

So *Wotton*; *Quid est in Christum credere? An id sommodo; credere vera esse, quæ Christus loquitur? At quid opus erat Spiritui Sancto tam novum & insolens verbum usurpare, præsertim obscurum etiam, & à vulgi intelligentiâ remotum? Quod rectè & clarè dici potuit, πιστεύειν, id Spiritus Sanctus novo more dicendi, de πιστεύειν, voluit obscurare? Nam hic certè loquendi modus, de πιστεύειν, totus est à Spiritu Sancto illi proprius, nec ullum è Græcis autorem agnoscit, ne illos quidem LXX Interpretes, qui Hebræa Biblia Græce reddiderunt, à quibus Apostoli & Evangelistæ multa in Scriptis suis, quod ipsum loquendi modum attinet, crebrò mutuentur. Quamobrem plus quàm verisimile videtur Spiritum Sanctum quum novo loquendi more uti-tur, quem fiduciam significare perspicuum est, aliud quiddam præter communem vocis significationem proponere voluisse.* De Reconcil. part 1. lib. 2. c. 14.

I find that *Seneca* doth use the Latin Phrase, *Hunc (inquit) Deum quis colet? quis credet in eum?* Where [*credet in eum*] is as much as [*fiduciam in eo collocabit*]. And so the Phrase of [*Believing in*] used in the New Testament, seems to import as much as the Phrases of [*Trusting in*] and [*staying on*] used in the Old Testament, as namely, *Isa.* 50. 10. See Mr. *Ball* of Faith, *part* 1. *chap.* 3. *p.* 24, *&c.* *In Ludo de morte Claudii Cæsaris.*

So far as I can judg, your success is not answerable to your desire. But if you did not intend to infer such a conclusion from your earnest seeking the Lord's Direction on your Knees, I know not to what purpose you did speak 61. (74.)

of it. For if it were only to ſhew the ſincerity of your deſire, What is your Cauſe advantaged, though that be granted, as I know not why any ſhould queſtion it ?

Ibid. What is that which you ſay is yeelded ? That Faith doth not juſtifie, as it is the fulfilling of the Condition of the whole Covenant ? Yet you make Juſtifying-Faith, as ſuch, to be the Condition of the whole Covenant: For you make it to include Obedience : and what doth the Covenant require more than Faith and Obedience ?

2. Of Juſtification begun, and Juſtification continued and conſummated by ſentence at Judgment, I have ſpoken before, nor is there need here to ſay any more of it.

Ibid. 1. No doubt the Holy Ghoſt means as he ſpeaks: But what of that ? Doth he ſpeak ſo as you interpret him ?

2. Though our Divines in expounding the words of St. *James*, expreſs themſelves diverſly, yet they agree in the Matter, *viz.* That Works do not concur with Faith unto Juſtification.

Of the Coven. *p.* 64. Mr. *Ball* ſpeaking of thoſe words, [Faith is imputed unto Righteouſneſs] ſaith, [*This Paſſage is diverſly interpreted by Orthodox Divines, all aiming at the ſame Truth, and meeting in the Main, being rather ſeveral Expreſſions of the ſame Truth, than different Interpretations*].

Then he ſhews three ſeveral ways whereby thoſe words are interpreted, which differ as much as theſe Interpretations which you mention. They that ſay, That the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of Juſtification *coram Deo*, by Works, underſtand a Working-Faith: They that expound it of Juſtification *coram Hominibus*, take the meaning to be, That by Works a Man doth appear to be juſtified. They that underſtand it of the Juſtification of the Perſon, make the ſenſe the ſame with thoſe firſt mentioned : and they that ſay it is meant of the Juſtification of a Man's Faith, agree with thoſe in the ſecond place, making Works to prove the ſincerity of Faith, and ſo to manifeſt a Man's Juſtification.

3. Are not thoſe words [*Hoc eſt Corpus meum*] as expreſs words of Scripture, as thoſe which you alledg ? Though words be never ſo expreſs, yet not only τὸ ῥητὸν, but alſo ἡ διάνοια is to be conſidered.

4. *James* might well and ſolidly prove by Works done many

many years after, that the Faith of *Abraham*, whereby he was justified, was a Working-Faith, of a Working Nature, a Faith fruitful in good Works, his Faith bringing forth such fruit in due season, and so shewing it self by Works when occasion did require. *Abraham* (no doubt) had many other Works, whereby his Faith did appear, yet the Apostle thought meet to instance in that Work, which was most remarkable; and by which his Faith did manifest it self in a more especial manner.

Hoc facinus (saith *Chrysostome*) *tanto praestantius erat caeteris omnibus, ut illa cum hoc collata nihil esse viderentur.* In 2 Cor. 1 Hom. 3.

What your Parenthesis doth mean (*Legal Justification I mean*) I do not well understand. But how doth *James* speak of Justification as Continued, and not as Begun? Is his meaning this, That a Man is indeed at first justified by Faith only, but both Faith and Works together do continue his Justification? So you understand it: but surely *James* doth neither speak, nor mean so. For by Faith alone without Works, in his sense, a Man never was, never can be justified. This is clear by his whole Discourse, for he calls him a vain Man that relies on such a Faith, and calls it a *dead Faith*, &c. So that when a Man is first justified, it is by a Working Faith: not that Faith must necessarily produce Works at the first, but it is (as I said) of a Working Nature, of such a Nature as to produce Works when they are required; which is the same with what you say out of *Grotius*: and this doth answer all that you object against the Interpretation which I stand for. Who can doubt but *Abraham* was justified long before he offered up *Isaac*, the Scripture being expres for it? But how then? Therefore this Work could be no Condition of that Justification which was past.

Answ. No indeed, that Work was not, nor could be; but Faith apt to shew it self by that Work, or any other, when required, and consequently a Working Faith might be, and was the Condition of that Justification. *Grotius*, whom you cite, giving you such a hint of it, I wonder that you could not observe this. *James* and *Paul* may well enough be reconciled, though both of them speak of Justification as Begun. For *James* doth not require Works otherwise than as Fruits of Faith, to be

brought forth in time convenient: and *Paul* doth not exclude Works in that ſenſe.

Of Juſtifying-Faith, §. 2. chap. 17. "[*Every obſervant Reader* (ſaith Dr. *Jackſon*) *may furniſh himſelf with plenty of Arguments all demonſtrative, that Works taken as St.* James *meant, not for the Act or Operation only, but either for the Act, or promptitude to it, are neceſſary to Juſtification*, &c.]

Ibid. And again, [*Faith virtually includes the ſame mind in us that was in Chriſt, a readineſs to do Works of every kind, which notwithſtanding are not Aſſociates of Faith in the buſineſs of Juſtification*].

Ibid. And thus he reconcileth the two Apoſtles, who in this Point ſeem to differ, [*St.* James *affirming we are juſtified by Works, and not by Faith only, ſpeaks of the Paſſive Qualification in the Subject, or Party to be juſtified, or made capable of abſolute Approbation, or final Abſolution. This qualification ſuppoſed, St.* Paul *ſpeaks of the Application of the Sentence, or of the ground of the Plea for Abſolution: the one* (by his Doctrine) *muſt be conceived, and the other ſought for only by Faith. The immediate and only cauſe of both he ſtill contends not to be in us, but without us: and for this reaſon, when he affirms that we are juſtified by Faith alone, he conſiders not Faith as it is a part of our qualification inherent, or the foundation of other Graces, but as it includes the Correlative Term, or Immediate Cauſe of Juſtification, whereunto it alone hath peculiar reference, and continual aſpect. This is that which in other terms ſome have delivered,* Fides juſtificat relative, non * effective, aut formaliter, &c.]

* *Not that Faith hath no efficiency at all in Juſtifying, but that it is not the Meritorious Cauſe of Juſtification.*

Take a few words more from this Author, (*Ibid.*) [*The Apoſtle levels his whole Diſcourſe to this Point maintained by us, That ſeeing Righteouſneſs was imputed to* Abraham *by Faith, and not through Works, none after him ſhould in this life at any time,* (*N. B.*) *whether before or after the infuſion of Grace, or Inherent Righteouſneſs, preſume to ſeek or hope for like approbation from God otherwiſe than only by Faith*].

How

How I exclude Love, I have shewed, even as you do, viz. Love of Complacency, which you grant doth follow Acceptance, that Act of Faith by which we are justified. And when I say that Protestants generally deny Faith, which is without Works to justifie, I mean Faith which is without works when God doth call for them. You might easily have perceived this to be my meaning by what I said out of *Cajetan de fide non sterili, sed fœcunda operibus.* A Tree is not said to be barren, except it doth not bring forth Fruit when the Season doth require.

5. I shewed you what I take to be meant *Jam.* 2. 23. when it is said, [*And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith,* Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness*]; *viz.* That by *Abraham*'s readiness to obey God in offering up *Isaac*, the truth of that Scripture did clearly appear, it was then most manifest, That *Abraham* believed God indeed, and that his Faith was a true Justifying-Faith, it being operative, and shewing forth it self so evidently by Works of Obedience, when they were required of him; so that the Scripture did well and truly say of him, That he *believed God, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness.*

Cajetan doth explicate it (me-thinks) very well. *Adverte* (saith he) *prudens Lector, quòd* Jacobus *non sentit fidem absque operibus mortuam esse, &c. Sed sentit fidem sine operibus, id est, nunquam operari, esse mortuam, esse vanam, & non justificantem. Et rectè sentit, quoniam, quæ non est parata operari, mortua est. Suâpte enim naturâ operatur per dilectionem, ut* Paulus *dicit. Quod ergo* Jacobus *affert verba,* Gen. 15. [*Credidit* Abraham *Deo, &c.*] *ad hoc affert, quod credidit paratus operari. Et propterea dicit, quod in opere oblationis filii impleta est Scriptura loquens de fide* Abrahæ *parata operari. Impleta, inquam, est quoad executionem maximi operis, ad quod parata erat fides* Abrahæ. *In Loc.*

And though you make light of this interpretation of *Cajetan*, as if it were nothing against you; yet *Calvin* doubted not to say, *Nodosum solubilem constrictos teneo, quicunque justitiam* Abrahæ *coram Deo imputatam fingunt, quia immolavit filium* Isaac, *qui nondum natus erat, quum Spiritus Sanctus pronunciat justum fuisse* Abraham. *Itaque necessario restat, ut aliquid posterius no-* *In Loc.*

tari discamus. Quomodo igitur Jacobus *id fuisse impletum dicit? Nempe ostendere vult, qualis illa fuerit fides, qua justificavit* Abraham, *non otiosa scilicet, aut evanida, sed qua illum Deo reddidit obsequentem; sicut etiam* Heb. 11. 8. *habetur.*

* He is express against it. *Instit. l.* 3. *c.* 17. §. 9. Of the Coven. p. 12, 79, 80

Calvin (it seems) never dreamed of being justified one way at first, * and another way afterwards. I would not have you put him off with a taunt, as you did before. *Parcius ista tamen, &c.*

But let Mr. *Blake* also be heard speak, [James *indeed* (saith he) *saith that* Abraham *was justified by Works, when he had offered* Isaac *his Son on the Altar,* Jam. 2. 21. *But either there we must understand a Working-Faith with* Piscator, Rareus, Pemble, *&c. and confess that* Paul *and* James *handle two distinct Questions, the one, Whether Faith alone justifies without Works? which he concludes in the Affirmative. The other, What Faith justifies, whether a Working-Faith only, and not a Faith that is dead & idle? Or else I know not how to make sense of the Apostle, who straight infers from* Abraham's *Justification by the offer of his Son; And the Scripture was fulfilled, that saith,* Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness. *How otherwise do these accord? He was justified by Works, and the Scripture was fulfilled, that saith, He was justified by Faith? Neither can I reconcile what he saith, if this be denied, with the whole current of the Gospel*].

And he adds a little after, [*All Works before or after Conversion, are inherent in us, or wrought by us, are excluded from Justification*].

Your Interpretations, *viz.* [*Abraham believed,* i. e. *believed and obeyed*]. Or, [*Yet the Scripture was fulfilled,* &c. *For Faith did justifie him, but not only Faith*]. are so uncouth and incongruous, that I wonder how you could perswade your self, much more think to perswade others to embrace them. *Paul* cites those words to prove that *Abraham* was justified only by Believing, and that Justification is by Faith only: And shall we admit of such an interpretation, [*Faith doth justifie, but not only?*] Or [*Abraham was justified by Believing and Obeying?*] What is this else but to make the Scripture a nose of wax, and to wrest it which way we please? Yea; What is it else but to make the Scripture plainly to contradict it self?

ſelf? And yet (forſooth) you pretend to ſtand upon the τὸ ῥητὸν, and the plain words of Scripture. But *Paul* (you ſay) ſpeaks of Juſtification as begun; and that (you grant) is by Faith only? Well, and for proof of his Doctrine (ſay I) he alledgeth the words of *Moſes* concerning *Abraham*. Muſt not thoſe words then be underſtood of the ſame Juſtification? Will you ſay with *Bellarmine*, that *Paul* ſpeaking of the firſt Juſtification, doth fetch a proof from the ſecond? As on the other ſide, he ſaith, that *James*, ſpeaking of the ſecond Juſtification, doth fetch a proof from the firſt? This is *Cælum Terra miſcere, & Mare Cælo.*

6. For my interpretation of *Jam.* 2. 22. I did not only affirm it to be ſo, but alſo ſhewed where the ſame phraſe is ſo uſed, *viz.* 2 Cor. 12. 9. And I find that Orthodox Writers do parallel thoſe places, and interpret the one by the other.

Thus *Camero*; *Fides* (*inquit*) *dicitur perfici operibus, quia Fides, dum producit opera, oſtendit quàm ſit perfecta: ut* 2 Cor. 12. 9. *Virtus Chriſti dicitur perfici in infirmitatibus, quia tum ſcilicet ſe maximè exerit, & prodit.* *Myroth. ad Jac.* 2. 22.

And ſo *Maccovius*; *Fides fuit perfecta ex operibus, quomodo virtus Chriſti perficitur in infirmitate,* 2 Cor. 12. 9. *quia in eâ ſe exerit: conſimili ratione Fides perfici per opera dicitur, quia per ea ſe prodit.* *De Juſtif. Diſp.* 10.

Generally I find the words thus expounded by thoſe that either comment upon them, or have occaſion to treat of them.

Dicitur ex operibus (ſaith *Calvin*) *fuiſſe perfecta, non quòd inde ſuam perfectionem accipiat, ſed quòd vera eſſe inde comprobetur.* *In Loc.*

So *Beza*; *Hoc igitur* (*inquit*) *ad declarationem quoque pertinet. Fides enim eo perfectior dicitur, quo plenius perſpecta eſt, ac cognita, & quo efficaciùs vires ſuas exerit quæ prius non ita apparebant.* *In Loc.* *Perfecta, i. e. perfectius cognita.*

Fulke doth cite *Beda* thus expounding it; [*His Faith was perfected by his Deeds, that is, by perfect execution of Works it was proved to be in his Heart*]. Tremell. *ad Loc.*

Thus alſo *Lud. de Dieu*, *Quatenus bona opera vitam fidei, ejuſque vim, efficaciam, ſinceritatem produnt, adeoque eam illuſtrant & exornant, rectè dicuntur perfecta Fides.* *In Loc.*

And

Symphon. Cathol. Cap. 36. Theſ 2.

And ſo *Polanus*; *Fides juſtificans perficitur ex bonis operibus, non quoad eſſentiam & conſtitutionem ſuam, ſed quatenus per ea firmatur, manifeſtatur, comprobatur; ſicut res aliqua tum fieri dicitur, quum patefit.*

Fides dicitur perfici per opera, quia per eaſe prodit Rivet. *Diſp. de Fide Juſtif. §. 20.*

And he cites the Interlineary Gloſs upon *Jam. 2. Per opera fides eſt augmentata & comprobata.*

And *Lyra*; *Et ex operibus fides conſummata eſt. Habitus enim firmatur & manifeſtatur per opera. Et ſimiliter magnitudo fidei* Abrahæ *apparuit ex ejus obedientiâ offerendo filium, propter quod dictum fuit ſibi à Domino; Nunc cognovi, &c.*

Of Faith, Part 1. c. 4. p. 44.

Thus alſo Mr. *Ball*, [*Faith is perfected by Works, not that the Nature of Faith receiveth complement or perfection from Works, but becauſe it doth declare and manifeſt it ſelf by Love and good Works, and is eſteemed ſo much the more perfect, as the Works produced are the more excellent*].

Animad. pag. 54. *Where I alſo cited Dr* Preſton *thus expounding it, and uſing this ſimilitude to illuſtrate it.*

To illuſtrate this, I uſed alſo the Similitude of a Tree, the goodneſs of whoſe Fruit doth but manifeſt the goodneſs of it; and ſo the power of Faith doth but appear by its fruits, *viz.* Works. You ſay that Faith is really perfected by Works, as a Tree is by bearing fruit. But (as our Saviour ſaith) *a Tree is known by his Fruit.* The Fruit doth not make the Tree good, but only ſhew it to be ſo. And this very Similitude have Learned Divines uſed to this purpoſe.

Beza immediately after the words before cited adds, *Ut ſi dicatur alicujus arboris bonitas tum fuiſſe perfecta, quum optimum aliquem fructum edidit. Nam quia de cauſâ judicamus ex effectu, videtur quodammodo cauſa vis vel minui, vel augeri ex effectorum proportione. Sed hoc ex effectis intelligitur quidem, & æſtimatur, non autem emanat.*

Ubi ſupra.

So Mr. *Ball*, [*How then ſaith the Apoſtle that Faith is perfected by Works? As we judg of the Cauſe by the Effects, and by the proportion of the Effects the efficacy and force of the Cauſe may ſeem to be increaſed or diminiſhed. Every thing is acknowledged to be perfect, when it worketh, and is eſteemed ſo much the more perfect, by how much the more it worketh: As we ſay the goodneſs of a Tree is perfect, when it hath brought forth ſome excellent good Fruit. Thus Philoſophers teach, That the*

Form

Form is not perfect, when it is considered as the first Act, but when it is taken as the second Act; for by working it putteth forth its force, and declareth it self. And so Faith is perfected by Works, &c.] as before cited.

You say also, That Faith is really perfected by Works, as a Covenant or Promise is by Performance. But the Performance doth only manifest the perfection of a Covenant or Promise. It is a perfect Covenant or Promise, as soon as it is made, if it be made sincerely and without guile, though it appears more fully to be so when it is performed. Again you say, That Faith is really perfected by Works, as it hath *naturam medii, viz.* Conditionis, to the Continuation and Consummation of Justification. But you have not yet proved, That there is any other Condition of Justification as Continued and Consummated, than of Justification as Begun.

Apprehensio illa fidei habet fluxum suum continuum, &c. (saith *Rivet*) *Quod continuum beneficium fide apprehensum, si secundam Justificationem appellare velint adversarii, imò tertiam, quartam, quintam, & millesimam, non repugnamus, dummodo constet nullâ aliâ ratione* (*N. B.*) *nos justificari à peccatis sequentibus, quàm eâ, quâ semel justificati fuimus à precedentibus.* *In Gen. 15 Exercit. 73.*

St. *James* doth not speak of Works perfecting Faith more to the continuing and consummating of Justification, than to the beginning of it. For (which must ever be remembred) he speaks of Faith as *apta nata operari*: and such a Faith is requisite, that we may be justified as well at first as afterward. Otherwise Works neither at first nor afterward do concur with Faith to our Justification.

[*A preparation or promptitude of Heart* (saith Mr. *Ball*) *to good Works, is an effect of Faith as immediate as Justification*]. Of Faith, Part 2. c. 4. p. 57.

And again, [*Faith doth not begin to apprehend Life, and leave the accomplishment to Works, but doth rest upon the Promise of Life until we come to enjoy it*]. *Ib.* Part 2. c. 4. p. 253.

Yet again you say, That Faith is really perfected by Works, as Works are a part of that necessary Matter (not necessary at the first moment of Believing, but necessary afterward, when we are called to it) whereby we are justified

justified against the Charge of non-performance of the New-Covenants Condition, even against the Charge of being an Unbeliever or an Hypocrite. But all this proves not that Works give any perfection to Faith, but only that they shew the perfection, *i. e.* the sincerity, force, and efficacy of it. Works may manifest a Man to be no Unbeliever or Hypocrite: but it is his Faith, which being unfained, doth indeed make him to be no Unbeliever or Hypocrite. All therefore that you have said, makes nothing against my interpretation of those words, *Jam.* 2. 22. [And by Works was Faith made perfect].

7. Your self deny *necessitatem præsentiæ operum* in respect of our being justified at first. And for the Conducibility of Works to the effect of Justification, *James* speaketh not of it, but only shews, that Justifying Faith is not without Works, *viz.* when God doth call for them. He shews that Justifying-Faith is a Working-Faith, a Faith ready to Work when occasion doth require: But that Works do therefore conduce unto Justification as well as Faith, he doth not shew, neither doth this any way follow upon the other. A Working-Faith is the Condition of Justification, *i. e.* Faith which is of such a nature as to bring forth the Fruit of good Works in due season; yet are we not therefore justified by Works as well as by Faith. For we are justified by Faith only apprehending Christ and his Righteousness; though the same Faith that doth this, will also produce good Works, as *Abraham*'s Faith did. That Works do justifie the Faith, but not the Person, though I use not to speak so, yet I think may be said without any implication of Contradiction. It is true, *Justificatio causa est etiam Justificatio personæ, non simpliciter & absolutè, sed quoad istam causam, & sam*: but they that use that distinction mean (I think) only this, that Works shew Faith to be sound and good, yet it is Faith and not Works, by which a Man is simply and absolutely justified. Do not (I pray) here lay hold on the word [*absolutely*]; it is referred to the word [*justified*] not to the word [*Faith*]. I do not say, That Faith absolutely considered doth justifie: no, it doth justifie as it is considered relatively; Faith, *i. e.* Christ apprehended by Faith, is that whereby we are absolutely justified. Though Works may justifie against the Accusation of being a final non-performer of the Condition (so

Fides sola justificat, quia ipsa est unicum instrumentum, & unica facultas, in nobis quæ recipimus justitiam, Christi. Bucan. *Loc.* 31. *ad quæst.* 37.

(ſo I would ſay, not Conditions, in reſpect of the Juſtification of which we ſpeak) of the New Covenant; yet do they not therefore ſimply and abſolutely juſtifie, but only againſt that Accuſation, ſhewing that a Man did perform the Condition, *viz.* believe, and ſo is ſimply and abſolutely juſtified, not by Works (which do but only declare him to be ſo) but by Faith, as the Condition or Inſtrument (for I will uſe the terms promiſcuouſly as others do) of Juſtification. Faith doth not juſtifie as Working, *i.e.* as bringing forth the Fruit of good Works; your ſelf deny this in reſpect of our Juſtification at firſt: yet Faith doth not juſtifie, except it be of a Working-Nature, *i.e.* of ſuch a Nature as to work when God calls for it. More than this cannot be inferred from *Jam.* 24. as is clear by the Context.

1. All Works, if good, are Works of the Law, *viz.* the Moral Law, which (as I ſaid in the *Animadverſions*) is the eternal Rule of Righteouſneſs. And of that Law the Apoſtle ſpeaks, when he excludes Works from Juſtification, as appears by his Reaſons which he uſeth for proof of his Aſſertion, *Rom.* 3.20. *Gal.* 3.10. 63.

Evangelii (*inquit* Maccovius) *nulla ſunt opera bona diſtincta à Lege formaliter. Adverſarii cum urgentur, ex operibus legis non juſtificari hominem, admittunt hoc, & dicunt, ita quidem eſſe, ſed non proinde non juſtificari operibus Evangelii. Hinc diſtinguunt inter opera Legis & Evangelii. Sed ſi obtineat hac diſtinctio, tum utique dabuntur etiam peccata, quæ committuntur * in Doctrinam Evangelii: Non ergo erit adæquata definitio peccati, quam dat Spiritus Sanctus,* 1 Joh. 3.4. *quòd peccatum ſit Legis tranſgreſſio.——At Evangelium diſtinguitur à Lege. Certè; interim Evangelii Doctrina præcipitur Lege. Nam Deus poſtulat, ut Evangelio credamus, &c.* *Theſ. Theolog.* Part 1. Diſp. 16.

* *Nempe Solam, & non etiam in Doctrinam Legis.*

So *Pemble*, [*Nor yet* (ſaith he) *hath this Diſtinction* (viz. *Works of the Law, and Works of the Goſpel*) *any ground in Scripture, or in Reaſon. For both tell us, That the Works commanded in the Law, and Works commanded in the Goſpel, are one and the ſame for the ſubſtance of them. What Work can be named, that is enjoyned us in the New Teſtament, which is not commanded us in that ſummary Precept of the Moral Law,* Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, Of Juſtif. Sect. 2. Chap. 2. §. 3.

Heart, and with all thy Soul, &c. *What is there against the Gospel, which is not a transgression of the Law?* — *You will say, It doth not command Faith in Christ. I answer, Yes, it doth. For that which commands us in general to believe what-ever God shall propose unto us, commands us also to believe in Christ, as soon as God shall make known that it is his Will we should believe in him.* [*The Gospel discovers to us the Object, the Law commands us the obedience of believing it*].

The Moral Law may be said to be a part of the New Covenant, as it requireth that they which have believed, be careful to maintain good works, *Tit.* 3. 8, 14. and to walk circumspectly (ἀκριβῶς *accuratè, i. e. quam proximè ad Legis Dei præcepta*, as *Beza* doth well expound it); *Ephes.* 5. 15. But this is far, and very far too from proving Works to have a co-interest with Faith in the effect of justifying. For your Reasons why the Apostle doth not exclude all Works absolutely from Justification, I see no strength in them; and therefore I answer; *Ad Loc.*

Ad 1. That which you call Justification against the Accusation of final Unbelief, is indeed *Justification* against the Accusation of Transgressing the whole Law. For that Accusation being only made void by Faith, where there is final Unbelief, there that Accusation hath its full force. Besides, though the Accusation of final Unbelief may be proved to be false by Works, yet Works upon this account do no otherwise justifie, than by manifesting a Man's Faith, by which Faith indeed, and not by Works he is justified.

Ad 2. So also that Justification which *James* speaketh of, is against a true Charge, and the same with *Remission* of sins, as well as that which *Paul* doth speak of. For can they that have but a dead *Faith*, be justified against a true Charge and have their sins remitted? Surely it must be a Living and a Working *Faith*, such as *James* doth require, can work that Effect. Justification against a false Accusation, is but such a Justification as the worst of Men and the Devils themselves are capable of.

De Justif. c. 3. S. 11. *Nemo enim iniquus adeò*, (as *Bradshaw* speaketh) *aut injustus dari potest, qui falsò accusari, & consequenter etiam eatenus meritò justificari non possit.*

Indeed Justification against the Accusation of final Unbelief, is by consequence a Justification against all Accu-

Accusations, because *Faith* is the Condition and Instrument of Universal Justification. But hence it follows that we are justified universally by *Faith*, and not by *Works*, which are only an Argument *à posteriori* of *Faith*, and so of Justification.

Ad 3. All Works that have a co-interest with *Faith* in Justification, are Competitors with Christ, or Copartners with him; so that Justification must be partly by the Righteousness of Christ through *Faith*, and partly by *Works*.

Ad 4. As the Righteousness of Christ is freely given or imputed at first upon condition of *Faith*, so is the free gift and imputation of it still continued upon the same condition of *Faith*; which *Faith* both when Justification is first begun, and when it is continued, must be a *Working-Faith*, *i. e.* ready to work as occasion doth require. If our Divines affirm, That the Apostle speaking against Justification by Works, means in point of merit, (as you say you could bring multitudes of them to this purpose) surely it is, because they know no other Justification by Works, but that which doth presuppose Works to be meritorious.

Hear one whom I (and so I presume you also) take for a good Divine, *viz.* Mr. *Blake*, [*This Justification* (saith he) *wrought freely by Grace through Faith*, Rom. 3. 24. *is no way consistent with Justification by Works. And what the Apostle speaks of Election, we may well apply to Justification: the same medium equally proves the truth of both; If by Grace, then it is no more of Works, otherwise Grace were no more Grace: But if it be of Works, then it is no more of Grace, otherwise Works were no more Works*, Rom. 11. 6.] Of the Coven. c. 12. p. 80.

Calvin also useth this Argument to confute those who would have Works to concur with *Faith* unto Justification, that then we should have somewhat to boast of, which is not to be admitted. *Sed quoniam* (*inquit*) *bona pars hominum justitiam ex fide & operibus compositam imaginatur, præmonstremus id quoque, sic inter se differre fidei operumque justitiam, ut altera stante necessario altera evertatur. Dicit Apostolus se omnia pro stercoribus reputasse, ut Christum lucrifaceret, &c.* (Phil. 3. 8, 9.) *Vides & contrariorum esse hic comparationem, & indicari propriam justitiam oportere pro derelicto haberi* *Instit.* l. 3. c. 11. §. 13.

haberi ab eo, qui velit Christi justitiam obtinere.—Id ipsum quoque ostendit, cum negat per Legem excludi gloriationem nostram, sed per fidem. Unde sequitur, quantisper manet quantulacunque operum justitia, manere nobis nonnullam gloriandi materiam. Jam si fides omnem gloriationem excludit, cum justitiâ fidei sociari nullo pacto justitia operum potest. In hunc sensum tam clarè loquitur quarto cap. ad Rom. *ut nullum cavillis aut tergiversationibus locum relinquat. Si operibus, inquit, justificatus est* Abraham, *habet gloriam. Subjungit, atque non habet gloriam apud Deum. Consequens ergo est, non justificatum esse operibus. Ponit deinde alterum argumentum à contrariis. Quum rependitur operibus merces, id fit ex debito, non ex gratiâ. Fidei autem tribuitur justitia secundum gratiam. Ergo id non est ex meritis operum. Valeat igitur eorum somnium,* (N.B.) *qui justitiam ex fide & operibus conflatam comminiscuntur.*

Who those multitudes of Divines be of whom you speak, I cannot tell, because you name none; but I think that few or none of them will be found of your mind, *viz.* That *Paul* doth only exclude Works from Justification in point of merit; as if Justification might be by Works in some other respect, so as that no merit thereby is presupposed. So far as I observe, our Divines note this as one main Argument, whereby the Apostle doth wholly exclude Works from Justification, because otherwise the merit of Works could not be denied, which yet is to be exploded.

Cent. 1. *lib.* 2. *c.* 4. *Col.* 257. *Arg.* 26. Thus the *Centuriists* among many other Arguments, whereby the Apostles (they say) prove Justification to be by *Faith* alone, note this for one; *Non est gloriandum in nobis, sed in Domino. Ergo non ex operibus, sed gratis justificamur, ne quis glorietur,* Ephes. 2. 1 Cor. 1.

Ad 5. All good Works (as I have shewed before) and consequently those whereby we perform obedience to the Redeemer, are works of the Law, it being the Rule to which they must be conformed. But it is *Faith* in the Redeemer, not Obedience to the Redeemer, by which we are justified, though *Justifying-Faith* must, and will shew it self by Obedience.

Ad 6. All Works that have an agency in Justification, are meritorious, and so make the Reward to be of Debt,

and

and not of Grace. Now to your Answers to my Arguments in *oppositum* I reply; And for the first thus: If *Abraham*'s Gospel-Works did justifie him otherwise than by evidencing his Faith, whereby he was justified, if they be made to have a co-interest with Faith in his Justification, then they are set in Competition or Copartnership with Christ's Righteousness.

That no Work of the Gospel doth justifie; Mr. *Pemble* proveth by this, That every Work of the Gospel, is a Work of the Law also; and therefore the Apostle denying that a Man is justified by the Works of the Law, doth consequently deny that he is justified by the Works of the Gospel. That Works do justifie as Conditions under Christ, is repugnant to what your self hold in respect of Justification as begun: and I see not, that the Scripture shews us any other Condition of Justification afterward than at first. Of Justif. §. 2. ch. 2. §. 2. See *Rivet* as cited pag. 145.

2. My Conclusion, That *Abraham* was not justified by Works, but by Faith, is not against *Jam.* 2. 21. no more than *Paul*'s Doctrine *Rom.* 3. & 4. is. For I mean, as *Paul* doth, That *Abraham*'s Works did not concur with his Faith to his Justification: but *James* meant only, That *Abraham*'s Faith was not such as some presume of a dead idle Faith, but a living working Faith; and that his Works did manifest his Faith to be such as whereby he was justified.

Cum obtulisset (*inquit* Bucanus) Abraham Isaac *filium suum super altare, ex operibus justificatus est, hoc est, compertum est fuisse justificatus per fidem, idque ex operibus tanquam testimonio Justificationis. Et sic homo operibus justificatur, id est, comprobatur esse illa persona, quæ Christi obedientiâ justificatur, ex vera sanctificatione quæ tanquam effectus illam sequitur, & de illâ testatur. Quomodo etiam Deus dicitur in extremo illo die justificaturus electos suos ex ipsorum operibus. Nam sunt duo principia, unum existentiæ, alterum cognitionis. Ità fides principium existentiæ facit, ut simus justi. Opera autem ut principium cognitionis faciunt, ut cognoscamur justi. Ideo Dominus in extremo die proponet principium cognitionis justitiæ fidei, quod incurret in oculos omnium creaturarum*, Mat. 25. *Venite benedicti, &c.* Loc. Com. Loc. 31. ad quæst. 39.

For the second; 1. The Apoſtle *Rom.* 4. 4. ſpeaketh without any diſtinction, *To him that worketh*, &c. Now (as you know) *non eſt diſtinguendum, ubi lex non diſtinguit.*

2. If Works juſtifie, then they muſt be meritorious. The Apoſtle doth not ſimply deny a Reward to belong of Grace to him that worketh, but to him that worketh ſo as to be juſtified by his Works. Such an one having no need of remiſſion of ſins, becauſe his Works do juſtifie him, (which they cannot do if they be imperfect, and ſo he need pardon) he is ſaid to receive the Reward, not of Grace, but of Debt.

* *Fides non juſtificat quatenus eſt opus juſtitiæ, ſed quatenus apprehendit juſtitiam Chriſti.* Rivet. *Diſput. de Fide Juſtif.* Sect. 19.

3. Faith as a * Work is excluded from Juſtification, only it juſtifieth as an Inſtrument or Hand receiving Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs. Or (which is to the ſame effect) Faith doth not juſtifie, as it is a Duty, which if we perform not we ſin; but as a Condition upon which the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed unto us for our Juſtification. You are not to be blamed for making uſe of *Bellarmine*'s Argument, (for ſo indeed it is, not his Anſwer) but for not taking notice how our Divines do anſwer it. See *Ameſ. contra. Bellar. tom. 4. lib. 5. cap. 4. ad 6.* Love, Hope, and Obedience are not Inſtruments of receiving Chriſt, as Faith is; neither doth the Scripture make them Conditions of Juſtification, as it doth Faith.

Fides ſola juſtificat, quia ipſa eſt unicum inſtrumentum, & unica facultas in nobis, quâ recipimus juſtitiam Chriſti. Bucan. *Loc.* 31. *ad quæſt.* 37.

For the Third; 1. Neither doth *James* ſpeak of any other Juſtification.

2. The imperfection of *Faith* proves that none are juſtified by it, as a Work or Duty, but only as apprehending Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs; See *Calv. Inſtit. lib. 3. cap.* 11. §. 7. And *Pemble* of *Juſtif. Sect.* 2. *chap.* 4. *pag.* 38.

3. No more do the greateſt Tranſgreſſors need pardon for that wherein they do not tranſgreſs.

4. Works

4. Works as Works either justifie by way of merit, or not at all: But *Faith* doth not justifie as a Work or Duty required of us, but as an Instrument receiving Christ, or (if you will) a Condition whereby we are made partakers of Christ's Righteousness, by which we are justified; See *Pemble* of *Justif.* §. 2. *chap.* 1. *pag.* 24.

The Exclusion (*viz.* of VVorks from being concurrent with Faith unto Justification) is not only Mr. *Pemble*'s, but generally all Protestants, and indeed *Paul*'s and the Scriptures: and to take in VVorks (in that sense) is as Mr. *Blake* before cited truly saith, against the whole current of the Gospel. 64.

1. To deny the Scripture to mean as you interpret it, is not to deny it to mean as it speaketh. Whether the Reasons which I alledged against your interpretation of St. *James* be forced, let others judg. *Ibid.* & 65.

2. It avails your cause nothing to prove, That *James* by working doth mean VVorks indeed. I presume Mr. *Pemble* would not deny that, but his meaning (I conceive) was, That VVorks are only spoken of as Fruits of Justifying *Faith*, and are only said to justifie, because they are (as Dr. *Jackson* speaketh) a passive qualification in the Subject or Party to be justified.

[*Hence* (saith he also) *is the seeming inconvenience of St.* James *his Causal form of Speech* (ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως) *easily answered. For the immediate and principal cause proposed, it is usual to attribute a kind of causality to the qualification of the Subject, though only requisite as a mere passive disposition, without which the principal or sole Agent shall want his efficacy*]. Of Justifying Faith, §. 2. *ch.* 17. §. 7.

All that St. *James* intended is this, That Justifying *Faith* is of a VVorking-Nature, and not such a *Faith* as some rely on, *viz.* barren and without VVorks. Now for your Reasons, I answer, *Ad* 1. You speak of the unprofitableness of bare *Faith*, *i. e.* (say you) Assent. But *quorsum hoc?* You know that Protestants make *Faith* to justifie, not as it is a bare Assent, but as it is a Receiving of Christ, and a Recumbency on him.

Fides hac justificans (saith *Ames.*) *non est illa generalis, quâ in intellectu assensum præbemus veritati in Sacris literis revelatæ, &c. Fides igitur illa propriè dicitur justificans, quâ incumbimus in Christum ad remissionem* *Medull. lib.* 1. *c.* 25. §. 15, 16.

peccatorum, & ſalutem. And this *Faith* they hold is not barren; but fruitful in good VVorks; though not VVorks, but *Faith* it ſelf (apprehending and applying Chriſt) be it, whereby we are juſtified.

Diſp. de Fide Juſt. §. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22. *Id fides excluſivè tribuendum ex eo conſtat, quod ſola eſt fides, qua Deo promittenti credit, qua ſola acquieſcit in gratuitâ promiſſione Dei in Chriſto, & remiſſionem peccatorum apprehendit, &c. Unde etiam ſequitur, Fidem non juſtificare, quatenus eſt opus juſtitiæ, ſed quatenus apprehendit juſtitiam Chriſti, &c. Nec* Jacobus *diſſentit à* Paulo, *quamvis alio modo loquendi utatur, ut redarguat eos, qui ſeipſos fallebant inani fidei juſtificationem tribuentes, quam probat non eſſe veram ab exemplo Charitatis, qua nullam vim habet, ſi tota ſit in verbis, c. 2. 16. Operibus autem juſtificari apud* Jacobum, *idem eſt, quod apud* Paulum, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. *juſtificari ſpiritu, i. e. Vi ſpiritus dare ſui experimentum, quomodo experimentum dedit* Abraham *fides ſua, offerendo filium ſuum: & homo probatus fit,* δόκιμος, *tentatione,* Jac. 1. 12. *qua probatio non facit ut res ſit, ſed per experientiam docet rem eſſe. Unde etiam fides dicitur perfici per opera, quia per ea ſe prodit. Ergo cum* Paulo *vult* Jacobus, *hominem juſtificari fide, ſed uterque eâ, qua ſui experimentum dat per opera: etſi neuter vult opera eſſe juſtificationis cauſas, aut ad juſtitiam coram Deo acceptari, quorum primum volunt Pontificii, alterum Sociniani & Remonſtrantes. Concludimus cum Apoſtolo, & colligimus, fide juſtificari hominem abſque operibus Legis,* Rom. 3. 28. *ſub quibus comprehendimus qualibet opera, quæ ſecundum Legem fiunt, etiam à ſanctis & fidelibus. Cum enim inter Legem factorum ſivè operum, & Legem fidei diſtinguat Apoſtolus, ibid. v. 27. ſi ex operibus juſtificemur, Legis operum & fides diſtinctio erit vana, & Argumentum ex eâ deductum pro fidei juſtificatione nutabit; quod abſurdum ut vitemus, ſcientes non juſtificari hominem ex operibus Legis, ſed tantùm per fidem Jeſu Chriſti; etiam nos in Jeſum Chriſtum credimus, ut juſtificemur ex fide Jeſu Chriſti, non ex operibus Legis,* Gal. 2. 22. *Sed cum eodem Apoſtolo fidum eſſe hunc ſermonem affirmamus ſtudendum eſſe iis, qui crediderunt Deo, ut bona opera tueantur,* Tit. 3. 8. *ut purificemus nos ab omni inquinamento, &c.* 2 Cor. 7. 1. *quod cum fiat de die in diem,* 2 Cor. 4. 16. *quam-*

di[n]

dit caro concupiscit adversus Spiritum, &c. Gal. 5. 17. *in eo non possumus coram Deo justificari. Nam in justificando partialem justitiam Deus non respicit, sed perfectam & planam, quia Lex maledicit omnibus, qui non permanebunt in omnibus quæ præcipit,* Deut. 27. 26. Gal. 3. 10.

I have been the larger in citing this Author, both because he is eminent, and also doth speak so fully to the Point, and doth meet with many of your Opinions.

But to proceed, It is *Faith* and *Faith*, *i. e.* several kinds of *Faith*, which St. *James* opposeth one to the other, *viz.* *Faith* which is a bare Assent, and without Works, such a *Faith* as the Devils have, and *Faith* which is moreover an embracing of Christ, and the mercy of God in Christ, and is attended with VVorks as the Fruits and Effects of it, as the *Faith* of *Abraham* and *Rahab* was. Though therefore he concludes, That *Faith* cannot save him that hath not VVorks, yet it follows not that VVorks concur with *Faith* unto Justification, but only that a Justifying *Faith* will shew it self by VVorks.

Ad 2. It is granted, That *Faith* which is no more than a bare Assent, is neither Justifying nor Saving: But what of this? Is there no other *Faith* than Assent? Do not you your self make Acceptance, which is more than Assent, the compleating Act of Justifying *Faith*? And how can you say, That there is the same force ascribed to VVorks as to *Faith*, when you make Justification at first to be by *Faith* without VVorks? Indeed VVorks are requisite in their place, but not as having the like force with *Faith* unto Justification, (shew any Orthodox VVriter that doth hold so) though as necessary Fruits of that *Faith*, by which we are justified. Say not that you speak of Justification as continued, for VVorks, as St. *James* doth speak of them, are as necessary unto Justification at first as afterward, *viz.* a promptitude and readiness to do good VVorks: if this be wanting, it is no Justifying *Faith*, but (as St. *James* calls it) *a dead Faith*, altogether vain and unprofitable.

Ad 3. That *Faith* without VVorks is a hardening of Unbelievers, I grant: *sed quid tum postea?* Do therefore VVorks justifie as well as *Faith*? But I do not think that St. *James* brings in (*chap.* 2. 18.) an Unbeliever so speaking. For how should an Unbeliever (a profes-

fed Unbeliever, we mean; for you use to distinguish betwixt an Unbeliever and an Hypocrite) speak of his *Faith*, saying, [*And I will shew thee my Faith*?]

In Loc. *Calvin* doth far better interpret it, saying, *Jacobus dicit, promptum fore piis sanctè viventibus, excutere hypocritis talem jactantiam, quâ inflati sunt.*

Ad 4. The Devils have a true Belief, *i. e.* a true Assent; but there is more than Assent in Justifying *Faith*, even that *Faith* whereby we are justified at first, as your self do hold. And you confess also that *Faith* doth justifie at first without VVorks; yet (say I) not except it be of a VVorking-Nature, *i. e.* ready to VVork, when VVorks are required: and otherwise than as Fruits of Justifying *Faith* VVorks do not justifie neither at first nor afterward.

Ad 5. Faith without VVorks is dead, as to the effect of Justification, even altogether unprofitable, *i. e.* Faith *renuens operari*, or which is not *parata operari*, as *Cajetan* doth well express it. But this is nothing to prove a Co-interest of VVorks with *Faith* in point of Justification; it only proves, That Justifying *Faith* is of a working Nature. VVhereas you add, [*Still here the opposite part on one side is Faith and Works, and on the other side Faith without Works*]; this doth nothing hinder, but that the opposition is (as I said) betwixt *Faith* and *Faith*, *i. e.* several kinds of *Faith*, whereof the one is accompanied with VVorks, and the other not; the one is operative and fruitful, the other idle & barren. That *Abraham* was justified not only by that *Faith* that did work, but also by VVorks, is more than St. *James* doth say, and is directly contradictory to what St. *Paul* saith. Indeed it is more than you can say, without your distinction of Justification Begun and Continued; which distinction St. *James* never thought of. For surely Justification cannot be at first by a dead and unprofitable Faith, as he affirms that to be, which is without VVorks. That in *Jam.* 2. 22. cannot be meant that Faith by VVorks is made perfect, as accomplishing its ends, but only as thereby declared and manifested to be perfect. The end of Faith is to justifie; and your self say, That Faith at first doth justifie without Works: so that in your Opinion Faith without VVorks is perfect, accomplishing its end in justifying at first. But in St. *James* his sense Faith doth not, cannot

In Jac. 2.

at

at all justifie without VVorks, *i. e.* if it be not ready to work: and in that respect VVorks do perfect Faith, *i. e.* they make the perfection of Faith to appear: but of that enough before.

Ad 6. And so of that also in *Jam.* 2. 23. enough hath been said already. That Faith alone is the Condition of the Initiation; but Faith and Obedience of the Confirmation, Continuation, and Consummation of Justification, you often say, but never prove. Sure I am *James* doth exclude Faith, which is without VVorks, *viz.* when God doth call for them, from the very Initiation of Justification. For he makes such a Faith as unprofitable as the Faith of Devils, who surely are so far from Justification, that they have not so much as the initiation of it.

Ad 7. You can never make more of that Conclusion *Jam.* 2. 24. than that a Man is justified by a VVorking Faith, or by a Faith which produceth VVorks, and so by his VVorks appears to be justified. The words if taken without any qualification, are against your self, who will have a Man justified at first by Faith without VVorks. If you will distinguish of Justification as at first, and as afterward, to make the Apostle agree with your meaning, though indeed it will not serve: Shall not others have leave to explain the Apostle so, as to make him agree not only with them, but also with himself, and the whole current of the Gospel? The word μόνον there imports no more than if it had been μόνως, as appears by the whole series of the Discourse, and more particularly by v. 17. where καθ' ἑαυτὴν is as much as μόνη, [*by it self*] *i. e.* alone without the concomitancy of VVorks, as the Fruits of it. *Beza* renders it *per se*; *Tremellius* out of the *Syriack Sola*: the Vulgar Latin hath *in semetipsa*, which *Cajetan* corrects, saying, *pro per se*, and that he expounds, *hoc est sola*. VVherein I suppose he followed *Erasmus*, whose Annotation on the place is, καθ' ἑαυτὴν, *i. e. per se, hoc est, sola.*

Ad 8. Rahab was justified by VVorks so as *Abraham* was, and all must be, even when they are first justified, *viz.* by a Faith prompt and ready to work when occasion doth require.

Ad 9. Our Divines by Faith understand a Sound and Orthodox Belief, *i. e.* Assent; and such is the Faith of the Devils spoken of *Jam.* 2. 19. such a Faith may be

without VVorks, and so is dead, *i. e.* unprofitable: but that is not the Justifying Faith which our Divines do speak of, (as I have shewed before) who hold that Faith alone doth justifie without VVorks, though withal they hold that Faith which doth justifie is not alone without VVorks, *viz.* when God doth call for them; and this is all that St. *James* urgeth. Your own *Analysis* doth evince no more than this, save that now and then you put a wrong gloss upon the Text, and ever and anon come in with your distinction betwixt the Initiation and the Continuation of Justification, quite besides, yea and against St. *James* his meaning, as (I think) I have sufficiently demonstrated.

In Jac. 2. *Oecumenius* a Greek Scholiast doth expound St. *James*, and reconcile him with St. *Paul*, after the same manner as I and others do; Οὐκ ἐν πράξει (saith he) τὴν πίστιν ἀναιρῶν Παῦλος, ἀλλ' ἐν ὑποστάσει· τὴν δὲ ὑποστατικὴν πίστιν ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦτο ἐδείκνυεν. Sometimes (he saith) Faith is taken for a bare Assent, ἐπὶ τῆς ἁπλῆς συγκαταθέσεως, and so the Devils believe: Sometimes it notes also a disposition joyned with assent, καὶ ἐλπίδας ἀκολουθούσας μετὰ βεβαίας συγκαταθέσεως. St. *James* (he saith) considereth Faith in the former sense, St. *Paul* in the latter. Ἐκεῖνος μὲν τὴν ἁπλῆν φησι συγκατάθεσιν πίστιν εἶναι πίστιν, &c. Παῦλος δὲ τὴν ἐνάρετον ἕξιν, ἣν ἐκ θεωρίας ἔγνω μάλιστα.

To conclude, It is not Faith as working that doth justifie, but Faith as apprehending Christ and his Righteousness: Yet that Faith which doth apprehend Christ and his Righteousness, and so doth justifie, is a Working Faith. Your self grant that VVorks are not necessary *quoad præsentiam*, in respect of Justification as begun: and that they are necessary *quoad effectum justificationis*, in respect of Justification as continued, is more (I presume) than ever will be proved.

65, &c. 1. I let pass those things which you speak of *Calvin*, because I see nothing but bare words. As for *Clemens Rom. Ignatius*, *Justin Martyr*, and the rest, who for 1000 years after *Paul* (you say) give as much to Works as you ever did, or more, and make Faith to justifie as a Condition, and * not as an Instrument, what-ever forced scraps some may gather out of a Line against the

* *To make Faith to be a Condition, is not to deny it to be an Instrument: Our Divines sometimes term it the one way, sometimes the other, as I have before shewed.*

the full scope of the whole Page or Book; I wish you had cited some Books, or Pages, or but Scraps, as you call them, whereby to make good what you say. I am not of such Reading, much less of such Memory, as to give an account of so many Authors, some of them either wholly or in part I have read, but I do not remember where they do *ex professo* treat of Justification, and therefore I do not marvel if they do not speak so accurately of it.

But for the Opinion of the Ancient Writers in this Point, I shall refer you unto some who were much better versed in them than I am, viz. *Fulk* on *Jam.* 2. 2. *Davenant de Justit. Habit. cap.* 29. where he answereth *Bellarmines* Allegations, and *cap.* 39. where he produceth his own.

And *Eckhard Compend. Theolog. Lib.* 2. *cap.* 31. who alledgeth *Chrysostome*, *Ambrose*, *Basil*, *Cyril*, *Austine* and *Bernard*, as holding Christ's Righteousness to be imputed unto us for our Justification. And he alledgeth *Ambrose*, *Hierome*, *Athanasius*, *Clemens Alex.* *Origen*, *Nazianzen*, *Chrysostome*, *Basil*, *Theodoret*, *Hesychius*, *Primasius*, *Epiphanius*, *Philastrius*, *Austin*, *Sedulius*, *Maximus*, *Theodulus*, *Fortunatus*, *Victor Mar.* and *Bernard*, as testifying that we are justified by Faith alone without Works; and yet he saith he doth but *aliquot ex veteribus antiquitatis testimonia, quod ad hanc rem spectat, delibare*: *Beda*, omitted by *Eckhard*, is cited by *B. Usher* as writing on *Psal.* 77. thus: *Per justitiam factorum nullus salvabitur, sed per solam justitiam fidei.* *De Statu & Success. &c. cap.* 2.

To your other Query concerning *Calvin*, *P. Martyr*, &c. I answer in the words of *Amesius*, *Fides specialis misericordia duplici ratione sic vocatur.* 1. *Quâ Christum apprehendit, vel innititur ipsi ad specialem misericordiam per ipsum apprehendendam.* 2. *Quâ misericordia specialem jam donatam apprehendit: priore sensu justificationem antecedit, posteriore sensu sequitur justificationem. Sed quia una & eadem est fides, quæ misericordiam Dei in Christo specialiter applicat apprehendendo, & applicationem illam jam factam certam reddit, & perfectio vel consolatio ejus in hac certitudine apparet, quam etiam hostes gratiæ precipuè impugnant, idcirco per istam certitudinem (quæ tamen quoad sensum à* *pag.* 46. *Contra Bell. tom.* 4. *lib.* 5. *c.* 2. §. 22.

fide

fide potest ad tempus separari) *fides justificans solet à multis describi.*

Medul. l. 1. c. 27. §. 19. And again, *Fides ista justificans suâ naturâ producit, atque adeò conjunctam secum habet specialem ac certam persuasionem de gratiâ ac misericordiâ Dei in Christo. Unde etiam per istam persuasionem fides justificans non malè sæpè describitur ab Orthodoxis, præsertim cum impugnant generalem illam fidem, cui omnia tribuunt Pontifices. Sed* 1. *ista persuasio quoad sensum ipsum non semper adest.* — 2. *Varii sunt gradus hujus persuasionis, &c.*

2. By Apprehending, I do not mean bare Assent, but Embracing, or Receiving, or Applying.

Contra Bellar. loco proximè citato. *Amesius* cites and approves these words of *Contarenus*; *Accipimus justificationem per fidem. Hanc acceptationem* Thomas *in* 3. *appellat applicationem, inquiens passionem Christi esse veluti Medicinam communem, quam quisque sibi applicat per fidem & Sacramenta. Protestantes appellant apprehensionem, non eâ significatione, quæ pertinet ad cognitionem intellectus, sed quâ illud dicimus apprehendere, quo pervenimus, & quod post nostrum nostrum attingimus.*

I think that although Justifying-Faith doth receive Christ intirely, yet as Justifying it receiveth him only in respect of his Satisfaction, which is the Righteousness by which we are justified. There is no danger in this Doctrine, so long as People are taught withal, that they must not look to have Christ as a Priest satisfying for them, except they also have him as a King reigning over them. Neither doth it seem to me any gross conceit, That apprehending or applying of Christ's Satisfaction, or of Christ as satisfying for us, is that act of Faith whereby we are justified. Your Similitude doth not suit; because a Husband cannot be offered to a VVoman in several respects, as Christ may be unto a Sinner. I do not conceive Faith to justifie *modo Physico*, or merely because it is of that nature to apprehend Christ and his Righteousness: If it were not for the Promise of the Gospel, this Act of Faith would not avail. As suppose the Devils should apprehend the Righteousness of Christ, yet should they not be justified, because the Promise of the Gospel doth not belong unto them. Yet this apprehending of Christ and his Righteousness being the Physical

Act

Act of Faith, and withal made the Condition of Justification, in that the Gospel doth promise Justification unto those that apprehend Christ and his Righteousness; I see not but I may well say, That Faith doth justifie us, apprehending Christ and his Righteousness, this being it which the Gospel doth require unto Justification. Faith as apprehending Christ being the Condition of Justification, it is all one to say, Faith doth justifie as apprehending Christ, and Faith doth justifie as the Condition required unto Justification. Whereas therefore you prove, That Faith or Acceptance of Christ simply considered in it self doth not justifie; it is nothing to me, who do not ascribe any thing to Faith in order to Justification as it is considered simply in it self, but as it being of such a nature is in that respect required of us, to that end that we may be justified. And thus (I think) do others mean, when they say, That Faith doth justifie as apprehending Christ, and his Righteousness: they do not (I suppose) exclude, but include the requiring of Faith in this respect as a Condition of Justification.

Pemble having said, [*We are justified by Faith*, i. e. *by the Righteousness of Christ, the benefit whereof unto our justification we are made partakers of by Faith, as the only Grace which accepts of the Promise, and gives us assurance of the Performance*]. He adds a little after, [*He that looked on Christ believing in him, may truly be said to be saved and justified by Faith, not for the worth, and by the efficacy of that Act of his, but as it is the Condition of the Promise of Grace, that must necessarily go before the Performance of it unto us; upon our obedience whereunto, God is pleased of his free Grace to justifie us*]. Of Justif. §. 2. c. 1. p. 27.

But still notwithstanding all you say, my Argument remains good; [*Works concur not with Faith in apprehending Christ, therefore they concur not with it in justifying*]. The Consequence is good, because Faith as apprehending Christ is made the Condition of Justification. For this is that which Believing in, or on Christ, doth import, which is put as equivalent to the receiving of Christ, *Joh.* 1. 12. That Repentance and Obedience do concur with Faith in being Conditions of Continued and Consummate Justification, you only affirm, but do not prove. Indeed Repentance as taken for an ac-

acknowledgment of, and sorrow for sin, is requisite unto Justification at first. For how should we ever look unto Christ as suffering for our sins, except we be sensible of them, and humbled for them. Yet it is Faith apprehending Christ, which in the Covenant is made the Condition of our Justification, as that whereby we are made partakers of Christ's Righteousness, by which we are justified. It is neither Repentance, nor Obedience, though Repentance (in the sence before-mentioned) must go before this Justifying-Faith, and so before Justification; and obedience must follow after.

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. l. 5. c. 4. §. 5. *Pœnitentia* (saith *Ames.*) *quatenus est legalis humiliatio antecedit quidem justificationem, ut dispositio ex ordine prærequisita, sed non ut causa. Respiscentia Evangelica vel notat conversionem totam, cujus primaria pars est fides, ut* Act. 11. & Ezech. 18. *vel est ipsa fides justificantis, atque adeo ipsius justificationis effectum, qualis fuit pœnitentia illa ad salutem,* 2 Cor. 7. 10. *Quotcunque modo accipiatur, dolor ac detestatio peccati non potest esse causa justificans, quia* (*N. B.*) *non habet vim apprehendendi nobis justitiam Christi. Acquisitio talis boni non consistit in aversatione mali. Respiscentia & fides differentia hac indigitatur,* Act. 20. 21. *Respiscentia in Deum, & fides in Dominum Nostrum Iesum Christum.* See also Mr. *Ball* of the *Coven.* c. 3. p. 18, 19, 69, &c.

1. You need not trouble your self to prove, That by VVorks are meant VVorks. For surely a working Faith, or a Faith bringing forth the Fruit of VVorks, doth imply VVorks. But the Question is, VVhether VVorks concur with Faith in justifying, or only are inseparable Attendants, and necessary Fruits of that Faith which justifieth. You hold the former, yet only in respect of continued and consummate Justification: I hold the latter in respect of Justification begun, continued, and consummate. VVhether of us hath more ground from Scripture, let it be judged by what hath been said about it.

But 1. whereas you say, That VVorks are still opposed to Faith without VVorks, or Faith alone, and not to this or that sort of Faith: I have shewed before from *Oecumenius* (not to speak of our late VVriters) that there is one sort of Faith that is with VVorks, or of a working Disposition, and such is Faith truly apprehending Christ:

and

and another ſort of Faith, that is without VVorks, *viz.* a bare Aſſent: and that St. *James* doth oppoſe theſe two ſorts of Faith one to the other, teaching that we are juſtified by the former, not by the latter.

2. You ſay, [*It is not only Faith alone without a working diſpoſition, but Faith alone without Works themſelves when there is opportunity*]; yet your ſelf deny not only the efficacy, but even the preſence of VVorks to be requiſite, when we are at firſt juſtified: and St. *James* denies Faith alone (ſo as he doth ſpeak of it) to have any force at all to juſtifie, as being dead and unprofitable. Therefore you muſt needs grant, That it is Faith alone, without a working Diſpoſition of which St. *James* ſpeaketh. Beſides, if there be a working Diſpoſition, there will be VVorks themſelves when there is opportunity. But all this doth only prove, That Juſtifying Faith is of a working Diſpoſition, and produceth VVorks themſelves when opportunity is offered: That VVorks do at any time concur with Faith unto Juſtification, it no way proveth.

3. Surely a diſpoſition to feed the hungry, is accepted of God, when there is no opportunity to do the thing it ſelf. And ſo a Diſpoſition to work may be enough to prove Faith to be of a right ſtamp, though VVorks themſelves be requiſite when there is opportunity: and ſtill I muſt put you in mind, that your ſelf requires no more than a diſpoſition to work, when we are firſt juſtified.

4. What you can infer from *Jam.* 2. 13. I do not ſee. He that expects mercy from God, muſt ſhew mercy to his Neighbour. Doth it therefore follow, that VVorks of Mercy juſtifie as well as Faith? No, but that Juſtifying Faith muſt and will ſhew it ſelf by VVorks of Mercy.

5. A real Faith being but a bare Aſſent, as in the Devils, cannot juſtifie or ſave. Who oppoſeth this? Or whom doth it oppoſe? So, that the ſame Faith is juſtifying and ſaving, I think all will yeeld: yet is there more required unto Salvation, as taken for the accompliſhment of it, than unto Juſtification.

6. VVho makes *James* v. 18. to ſpeak ſuch non-ſence as you tell of? Do they, who ſay his meaning is, That Faith is pretended in vain, if it do not ſhew it ſelf by VVorks, as occaſion doth require? And what more can any gather from v. 20, 22, 24, 26? You might ſave your

labour

labour of proving, That by VVorks are meant VVorks; you ſhould prove that Works are ſpoken of as concurring with Faith, and as having a co-intereſt with it in the effect of juſtifying, and not only as Fruits of that Faith by which we are juſtified. This is that which they mean, who ſay that *James* doth ſpeak of a working Faith, *i. e.* a Faith ready to work, and ſo actually working, when God doth require it, not as if inſtead of [Works] it were good ſenſe always to put [a working Faith]. Such ſophiſtry doth not become us.

7. That *James* doth aſſert the neceſſity of Works, as fruits of Juſtifying Faith, is ever granted: that he doth aſſert the neceſſity of them as concurrent with Faith unto Juſtification, is never proved. Works are therefore neceſſary to prove Faith to be ſuch as God requires unto Juſtification.

Againſt this firſt you ſay, *James* doth make VVorks or Working neceſſary to juſtifie; I ſay, he doth not, but only drives at this, That none muſt think to be juſtified by Faith, except it be a working Faith, as *Abraham*'s and *Rahab*'s was. You ſay, [*The Soul doth not truly ſignifie the Body to be alive*]. But the word *Jam.* 2. 26. is πνεῦμα, Breath, which is but an effect of Life, and not a cauſe of it.

Of Grace and Faith, *pag.* 240. Appendix to the Doctrine of the Certainty of Salvation.

[*Thus* (ſaith *Pemble*) *the compariſon is exact; As the Body without Breath is dead, ſo is Faith without Works*].

So *Downham*; [*Neither doth St.* James *compare Works to the Soul, but to the Breath, as the word* πνεῦμα (*derived of* πνέω *to Breath*) *doth properly ſignifie*, &c. *So that the meaning of St.* James *is, As the Body without Breath is dead, even ſo Faith without Works* (*which are as it were the breathing of a lively Faith*) *is dead*].

But if by πνεῦμα there be meant the Soul, as 1 *Cor.* 6. *ult.* I hope you will not ſo underſtand it, as to compare Faith to the Body, and Works to the Soul, as if Works were the Soul of Faith, and ſo did give Life unto it: whereas indeed Faith doth produce Works, and Works do but evidence Faith, and the lively power of it.

On *Jam.* 2. *ult.*

[*The Apoſtle* (ſaith *Fulk*) *in this Similitude doth not make Faith the Body, and Works the Soul; but Works the Argument of the Life and Soul of Faith, which is truſt in God*, &c.]

2. God

2. God (you say) needs no Signs. Well, but God (say I) requiring such a Faith, whereof Works are Signs, as Fruits and Effects of it, we must look to the signs of our Faith, to find it such as God requires of us to our Justification. *Maccovius* (it seems) met with the Objection; *At Deo non est opus experimento.* Resp. *Hoc sane verum est: at non proinde sequitur homines non prabere sui experimentum Deo.* *De Justif. Disp. 10. sub plura in hanc rem vide: licet.*

3. Faith may be real, and yet not justifying. A real Assent, yea and Consent, if limited, so as to exclude Christ's dominion over us, is not that Faith which your Opposers plead for.

4. The New Testament doth make a working Faith, yet not Faith as working the Condition of Justification. I wonder how you can stumble at this, when as you constantly hold, That we are justified at first by Faith without Works: yet surely that Faith whereby we are justified at first, is a working Faith, *i. e.* of a working Nature, and will, when there is opportunity, shew it self by Works. That working therefore is together with Faith the Condition of Justification, is more than your own Principles will admit, without that distinction of Justification Inchoated, and Justification Continued, of which though you make much use, yet I see little ground for it. Now for Dr. *Preston*'s words, which I cited, I think they are clear enough against you.

For first he saith, That Faith alone justifieth and maketh Works only Concomitants or Fruits of that Faith by which we are justified. You limit it to Justification as begun, but he speaks of Justification simply considered, and not as begun only.

2. He speaks indeed of a double Justification, but not as you do, nor to that intent to bring in a double Righteousness as requisite unto Justification. All that he intends is this, That we are justified only by Faith, according to *Paul*'s Doctrine; yet (as *James* teacheth) our Faith must appear to be a true Justifying Faith by Works, otherwise it is but a false and feigned Faith, as it pretendeth to be Justifying, and he that pretendeth it, is a Hypocrite. His words without doing violence unto them, can have no other sense put upon them. When any one is accused of being but a seeming Believer, or a mere Believer without Obedience, take Believing merely as it

is

is the Condition of Justification by the Covenant, it is but (as I have often said) the making good this Accusation, That he is a Transgressor of the Law, and to be condemned by the Law for the transgression of it, and so much the more in that he neglected the benefit offered in the New Covenant. So that in this case to justifie a Man by his Faith and VVorks, is but indeed to plead that he is justified by the Righteousness of Christ imputed unto him through Faith, which Faith is proved to be sound and good by his VVorks.

1. I see you are very tenacious of your Opinion: but if you will not forsake your Opinion till you see better Arguments to draw you from it, marvel not if others will not embrace your Opinion till they see better Arguments to draw them to it. But to the Matter; Me thinks you might easily see the meaning of this, that *Abraham's* first Justification could not be by Faith, which was without VVorks, *i. e.* by Faith, which was not of a working Nature.

Thus in that very page (52.) I explained my self, saying, [Faith if it be alone without VVorks, *i. e. renuens operari, &c.* cannot justifie].

2. Do not you see that your Answer is to no purpose in limiting the words of the Apostle to Continued and Consummate Justification, whereas he doth utterly exclude Faith, which is without VVorks, or which is not of a working Disposition, from being able to justifie, as being a Faith that is dead and unprofitable?

In Jac. 2. 23. That which you so slight, as if it were *indignus vindice nodus*, Calvin (a Man as likely to see into the Apostle's meaning as another) calls *nodum insolubilem*, as I have before noted. That more Conditions are required unto Justification afterward than at first, is more than I can find, and more (I am perswaded) than will ever be proved. Did *Paul* when he speaketh so much of Justification by Faith without VVorks, *viz.* as concurring with Faith unto Justification, mean that we are so justified indeed to day, but not so to morrow, or some time after? All his Arguments shew the contrary. Yea, doth he not prove from *Gen.* 15. 6. that *Abraham* was justified only by Believing, when as yet that was not the beginning of his Justification? So when *James* saith, That we are not justified by Faith, which is without VVorks, such a Faith being

being dead, and no better than the Faith of Devils; was his meaning this, That hereafter indeed we cannot be so justified, but yet at present we may? If you be of this mind, *Non equidem invideo, miror magis.*

3. Of the sense of *James* his Discourse enough before. And for v. 17. I think it might easily let you see that he speaketh not (as you suppose) only of Continued and Consummate Justification, but of Inchoated also, and consequently that he cannot be interpreted otherwise than thus, That Faith which doth not shew it self by VVorks, is dead, ineffectual, and of no force to justifie, either at first or afterward, as not being that Faith which is required unto Justification, *viz.* a working Faith, or Faith which is of a working Nature. I have noted before what *Oecumenius* (one that was long before either *Calvin* or *Luther*) saith upon that very Verse, as also how in the judgment of the Syriack Interpreter, and other Learned Men κατ' ἐαυτὸ there is to be understood.

1. Though Faith may be true and real without Works, yet a living Faith it is not; for a living Faith is operative, so that, a working Faith, and a non-working Faith are of different Natures, this being but a bare and naked Assent, but the other an apprehending of Christ, and a receiving of him. I little doubt but the Faith of Devils, and the Faith of Men who are justified (even at first, when you say VVorks are not requisite in respect of their presence with Faith, though that Faith (say I) is of a working Disposition), differ much in their very Nature. *ibid.*

2. If you will be true to your own Principles, you cannot say, That VVorks make Faith alive, or that Faith is not alive without VVorks as actually present, though you consider Faith meerly as a Condition of Justification, seeing you hold Faith to be alive in that respect, when we are first justified, though there be no VVorks present with it. And though, as there must be a promptitude to VVorks at first, so there must be VVorks themselves in due season; yet that VVorks do afterward concur with Faith unto Justification, is more than yet I see, or (I presume) ever shall see proved.

3. Therefore my Argument stands good against you, until you can make it appear, That Faith alone without the Copartnership of VVorks, is the Condition of Justi-

fication at first, but Faith and VVorks together of Justification afterward. I have shewed some Reasons against it, but I can see none for it. Your Similitude of a Fine, &c. is no proof. Similitudes may illustrate something, but they prove nothing.

Ibid. 7. You said, [*The Apostle saith, That Faith did Work in and with his Works*]; whereas the Apostle using the word συνεργει did not speak of working in, but only of working with.

2. Of what validity that distinction is (of Justification Inchoated, and Justification Continued and Consummate) you have not yet shewed.

3. VVhat *Calvin's* Opinion otherwise was, is not to the purpose. I only alledged his Exposition of those words, *Fides cooperata est operibus suis*; and I think his Exposition is genuine.

On *Jam.* 2. 22. So also Mr. *Manton*; [*That sense which I prefer,* (saith he) *is, That his Faith rested not in a naked bare Profession, but was operative, it had its efficacy and influence upon his Works, co-working with all other Graces: it doth not only exert, and put forth it self in acts of Believing, but also in working*].

Beza renders it, *Administra fuit operum ejus*, and expounds it, *Efficax & fœcunda bonorum operum.*

Ibid. & 73. 1. I shewed before how not only *Piscator* and *Pemble*, but many others both before and after them, interpret those words, [*By Works his Faith was made perfect*]; *i. e.* By VVorks his Faith did appear perfect, *i. e.* sound and good. This Exposition is such that as yet I see no reason to dislike it.

2. I grant that Faith without VVorks (*viz.* when God doth require them) is dead as to the effect of Justifying; Yea, and it is also dead in it self, being but a dead Assent, having no life, no operative vertue in it.

3. *Abraham's* Faith was, is, and shall be manifested to be perfect, *i. e.* sincere by his VVorks, to all that were, are, and shall be able to discern the true nature of Justifying Faith. Although there were none then that could discern this, (which yet is not to be supposed, *Isaac* was then of age to discern it, and so others of *Abraham's* Family to whom the thing was known) yet to after-Ages the perfection of *Abraham's* Faith is made manifest by his VVorks, especially his offering his Son upon the Altar.

And

And if God did say, [*Now I know that thou fearest me*, &c.] why may it not be said, speaking of God, *ἀνθρωποπαθῶς*, that thereby *Abraham*'s Faith and its Perfection appeared to God himself? Certain it is, that the VVork spoken of did proceed from Faith, *Heb.* 11. 7. And therefore as the Effect doth shew the Cause to be perfect, so did *Abraham*'s VVorks (especially that of offering up *Isaac*) shew his Faith to be perfect. To the Second:

1. Though Justifying Faith include in it three Acts, mentioned *Heb.* 11. 13. yet there are but two of them properly and peculiarly Acts of Faith. For Seeing, or Knowing, the first there mentioned, is but presupposed unto Faith.

Bellarmine in this saith truly, (though it was little to his purpose); *Cognitio apprehensiva præexigitur quidem ad fidem, sed non est ipsa propriè fides.* *De Justif. lib. 1. c. 16.*

The other two Acts, *viz.* Perswasion and Embracing, though distinct, yet are both comprehended in Believing.

2. I see no cloudiness in this, [*Believing justifieth, not as it is our Act, but in respect of its Object*]; neither is this to speak darkness, except to a dark Understanding, which (I know) yours is not. But you know what is said of some, *Faciunt nimium intelligendo, ut nihil intelligant.* VVhat is more vulgar with Divines (and those no vulgar ones neither) than to say, That Faith doth not justifie as it is a VVork of ours, but in respect of its Object, Christ, whom it apprehendeth, and by whom so apprehended, we are justified?

Hujus satisfactionis apprehendendæ medium (saith one whom *Rivet* much commends) *fides est. Deo sic ordinante, ut non aliis illius participes sint, quàm qui eam sincerâ fide amplectuntur, non ita tamen ut ipsa fides ratione sui vel Deo gratos faciat & acceptos, sed ratione objecti, quod apprehendit, & cujus meritum nobis applicat, & perfectam obedientiam.* Vigner. *de Satisfact. Christi in ter o era* Rivet. *Disp.* 13.

So *Rivet* himself saith; *Fides non justificat, quatenus est opus justitiæ, sed quatenus apprehendit justitiam Christi.* *De Fide Justif. Disp.* 10.

Divers others to this purpose have been cited before. Your Question [*Why doth not the Object justifie without the Act?*] is soon answered; Because the Act (Believing)

lieving) is required on our part, *Deo ſic ordinante*, (as the Author before-cited ſaith) That ſo the Object (Chriſt's Righteouſneſs) may become ours unto Juſtification: yet ſtill it is in reſpect of the Object (Chriſt's Righteouſneſs) that the Act (Believing) doth juſtifie. You darken my words, when you transform them thus, [*It juſtifieth in reſpect to its Object*]; I ſay, [in reſpect of its Object], and ſo you firſt cited it. My meaning is this, It is the Object of Faith, *viz.* Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, though as apprehended by Faith, whereby we are juſtified.

Medul. l. 1. c. 27. §. 14. *Eſt autem hæc juſtificatio propter Chriſtum* (ſaith *Ameſius*) *non abſoluta conſideratum, quo ſenſu Chriſtus etiam eſt cauſa ipſius vocationis, ſed propter Chriſtum fide apprehenſum.*

This is clear by that *Acts* 13. 39. [*By him all that believe are juſtified*].

Of the Coven. *c. 6. p. 65.* I will add Mr. *Ball*'s words, which in ſenſe are the ſame with mine, and there is little difference (as to clearneſs or cloudineſs) in the Expreſſion; [*The Third Expoſition is, That when Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſs, it is not underſtood materially, as though the Dignity, Worth, and Perfection of Faith made us juſt; but relatively and in reſpect of its Object: that is, to us believing, Righteouſneſs, ſc. of Chriſt, is freely imputed, and by Faith we freely receive Righteouſneſs, and remiſſion of ſin freely given of God. And therefore to ſay, Faith juſtifieth, and Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſs, are phraſes equivalent. For Faith juſtifieth not by its merit or dignity, but as an Inſtrument, and correlatively, that is, the merit of Chriſt apprehended and received by Faith, juſtifieth, not Faith, whereby it is apprehended and received, unleſs it be by an improper ſpeech, whereby the Act of the Object, by reaſon of the near and ſtrict connexion betwixt them, is given to the Inſtrument*].

3. What you have ſaid before about Works perfecting Faith, hath been conſidered. Though Faith may ſave without manifeſtation, yet not except it be of that nature, as to manifeſt it ſelf by Works, when God doth call for them.

You ſay, [*Works do perfect Faith, ut Medium & Conditio*]; you mean of Juſtification: but that Works are *Medium & Conditio Juſtificationis*, you do not prove.

The

The Tree and its Fruit are considered as distinct; *ut Causa & Effectum, non ut Totum & Pars*; and so the perfection of the Tree is only manifested by its Fruit. It is not therefore a good Tree, because it beareth good fruit; but it therefore beareth good Fruit, because it is a good Tree.

For the Third: If Procreation (as you grant) do not perfect Marriage in its Essence, then it adds only an accidental perfection unto it.

4. Your Explication is indeed now more full, so that I can better see your meaning, yet still I am unsatisfied. For I do not conceive that Faith properly is our Covenant, but that whereby we embrace God's Covenant. Though a Covenant differ from a Promise, yet it doth include a Promise. Now a Promise is *de futuro*; so that our reciprocal Promise, both of Faith and Obedience, I take to be our Covenant. Faith is in part the matter of the Covenant, but not properly the Covenant it self, and perhaps when you call it our Covenant, you only mean, that it is the matter of our Covenant.

I being there the Respondent, it was sufficient for me to deny, the proof did lie upon you. Yet nevertheless the Assertion (*viz.* Faith alone is the Condition of the Covenant, for so much as concerns Justification) is sufficiently proved by those places, where we are said to be justified by Faith, and that without Works, *viz.* as concurring with Faith unto Justification. And for the reason of the Assertion, (*viz.* because Faith alone doth apprehend Christ's Righteousness) much hath been said of it before. What do our Divines more inculcate than this? 73.

Wotton saith, that only Faith doth justifie; *Quia sola fide recte in Christum tendimus, & promissiones Dei de justificatione amplectimur. De Reconcil. Part* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 18.

Amesius saith; *Dolor ac detestatio peccati non potest esse causa justificans, quia non habet vim applicandi nobis justitiam Christi. Contra* Bellar. *tom.* 4. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 4. *sect.* 5.

So *Bucanus*; *Fides* (*inquit*) *sola justificat, quia ipsa est unicum instrumentum, & unica facultas in nobis qua recipimus justitiam Christi. Loc.* 31. *ad Q.* 37.

Of the Covén. chap. 3. p.18,19.

Thus also Mr. *Ball*; [*By Repentance we know our selves, we feel our selves, we hunger and thirst after Grace; but the hand which we stretch forth to receive it, is Faith alone,* &c.] And a little after; [*When therefore Justification and Life is said to be by Faith, it is manifestly signified, That Faith receiving the Promise, doth receive Righteousness and Life freely promised*].

You your self do sometimes say, That Faith hath in it an aptitude to justifie in this respect; only you deny, that this aptitude of Faith is sufficient, and say that therefore it doth justifie, because God in his Covenant hath made it the Condition of Justification. Now I also grant, That if Faith were not ordained to that end of God, its bare aptitude, or its being that whereby we apprehend Christ, would not justifie. Yet (I say) it appears by Scripture, That because Faith alone hath this aptitude to justifie, *viz.* by apprehending Christ, therefore God hath made it alone the Condition of Justification. This appears in that we are said to be justified by Believing in, or on Christ, which imports an apprehending and receiving of him, *Joh.* 1. 12.

2. Repentance doth avail with Faith, yet are we justified only by Faith, and not by Repentance, and that for the reason even now alledged, *viz.* because not Repentance, but Faith is the Hand by which Christ is received.

3. Though Remission of Sins be ordinarily ascribed to Repentance, yet it is no where said, That Repentance is imputed unto us for Righteousness, as it is said of Faith. Repentance in some sense is precedaneous to Justification, Justifying Faith doth presuppose Repentance; yet Faith and not Repentance is made the Condition and Instrument of Justification, as being that which doth apprehend the Righteousness of Christ, by which we are justified.

4. That though Faith only be the Condition of Justification at first, yet Obedience also is a Condition afterward, is often said, but never proved. I take Justification both at first and afterward to be by the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us; therefore not by Obedience, but by Faith, by which alone we apprehend the Righteousness of Christ, that so it may be ours unto Justification. Certainly that was not the beginning of *Abraham's*

ham's Justification, which is mentioned *Gen. 15. 6.* Yet by that doth the Apostle prove that *Abraham* was, and all must be, justified, not by Obedience, but by Faith only.

1. Faith apt to produce good Works, is necessary to procure that first change, which makes us (in God's account) *Justos ex Injustis*. For if it be not such a Faith, it is dead, and of no force. *Ib.* & 74.

2. I hope you will not deny, but that being justified by Believing, every after Act of Faith doth find us justified; for you are against the Amission and Intercision of Justification. Yet I confess, That the continuance of Faith is necessary to the continuance of Justification. So it must needs be, seeing we are justified by Faith; therefore every Act of Faith may be said to justifie, as well as the first Act, because by after-Acts of Faith we continue justified.

Nihil erit absurdi, (inquit Rivetus) *si dicamus, in* *In Gen.* 15.
qualibet vera fidei actu imputari justitiam credenti. Etsi *Exer.* 83.
enim justificatio sit actus momentaneus, cujus nunquam
planè amittitur effectus in piis, qui semel justificati
sunt, indigent nihilominùs renovatione sensûs justificati-
onis suæ, qui sensus fit per fidem, & tunc dicitur vera
ejus fides imputari ad justitiam. Nam apprehensio illa
fidei habet fluxum suum continuum secundum plus &
minus; præsertim cum fidelis, & si justificatus, subinde
in peccata incidat, propter quæ opus etiam habet remissi-
one peccatorum. Quod continuum beneficium fide ap-
prehensum, si secundam justificationem appellare velint
adversarii, imò tertiam, quartam, quintam, & millesi-
mam, non repugnabimus, dummodo constet, nullâ aliâ
ratione nos justificari à peccatis sequentibus, quàm eâ,
quâ semel justificati fuimus à præcedentibus.

Works therefore do not concur with Faith unto Justification no more afterward than at first.

3. Your reasons whereby you endeavour to confute this Assertion, [*As our Justification is begun, so it is continued, viz. by Faith only, and not by Works as concurrent with Faith unto Justification afterward, though not at first*] seem to be of no force.

I answer therefore, *Ad* 1. How do I contradict it by saying, [As it is begun, so it is continued by Faith?] What though there be divers Acts of Faith, yet still it is

Faith, and Faith without the concurrence of Works, by which we are justified as well afterward as at first, which is all that I assert? Because a continued Act of Faith is requisite to the Continuation of Justification, doth it therefore follow that Works have a co-interest with Faith in the effect of Justifying?

* How Repentance is requisite unto Justification, and yet doth not justifie, was shewed before. 74.

Ad 3. Do you think * Repentance only requisite to the Continuation of Justification, and not also to the Inchoation of it?

Ad 3. We are not to measure God's Covenant by Humane Covenants. God's Covenant doth reach further than to Justification; and more may be requisite for the enjoyment of those benefits which belong unto Justified Persons, than is requisite unto Justification.

Your Similitudes are no Proofs; and you still suppose that there is one Condition of Justification at first, and another Condition thereof afterwards; that though at first we are justified only by Faith, yet afterward by Faith and Works, but though Works are required of Justified Persons, as Fruits of that Faith whereby they are justified; yet they do not therefore concur with Faith unto Justification, which as it is begun by Faith only, so is it also continued. Your self observe, That *Abraham*'s believing, mentioned *Gen.* 15. was not his first Act of Faith. So then he was justified before by Faith, and so was he also afterward, even by Faith only, as the Apostle from that very place doth prove *Rom.* 4. Therefore by Faith without Works (*viz.* as having a co-partnership with Faith in Justifying), *Abraham* was justified both at first and afterward.

Ibid.

2. Do you think that *Abraham* was justified from the guilt of those many sins, which he committed after his first Justification by his Works? *Credat Judæus*: for my part I cannot but detest such Doctrine. I know no way whereby he could be justified from those sins, but by Faith in Christ, even as he was at first justified. Besides (as I noted before, and that as acknowledged by your self), *Abraham* was justified before he produced that Act of Faith spoken of *Gen.* 15. and in the *interim* no doubt he committed some sins, yet still by Faith, and not by Works (as *Paul* sheweth)? he was justified.

† *Vide* Calvin. *Instit. l.* 3. *c.* 14 §. 11.

2. You do but still affirm, without any proof at all, That *Abraham*'s Justification could not be continued by the

the same means (*viz.* by Faith alone) works not concurring with it unto Justification) as it was begun.

3. For Sentential Justification at the Last Judgment, I have said enough before.

Bucan having said, that *Abraham* was Justified *operibus, tanquam testimoniis Justificationis*; Adds, *Quomodo etiam Deus dicitur in extremo illo die justificaturus electos suos ex ipsorum operibus.* *Loc. 31. ad quæst. 39.*

And again; *Fides principium existentiæ, facit ut simus justi; Opera autem ut principium cognitionis faciunt, ut cognoscamur justi. Ideò Deus in extremo die proponet principium cognitionis justitiæ fidei, quod incurret in oculos omnium creaturarum.*

4. I think the Argument is good and sound, [Christ's Righteousness, whereby we are justified, is an everlasting Righteousness; therefore our Justification is an everlasting Justification]. This alwayes presupposed, That this Righteousness of Christ be apprehended by Faith; for otherwise there is no being justified at all by it.

1. To be just *quoad præstationem Conditionis*, is but to be just in some respect; and in some respect just even the most unjust may be. Yet it is true, This *præstatio Conditionis* will be of force to procure Universal Justification: not that it is it self the Righteousness by which we are justified, but only the Means whereby we are made Partakers of the Righteousness of Christ, and so by his Righteousness are universally justified. And though this performing of the Condition be required unto Justification, yet nevertheless that remains good which I said in the *Animadversions*, [*If we be fully freed from the accusation of the Law, we are fully justified*]. For can we be fully freed from the Accusation of the Law, except we perform the Condition required in the Gospel? And if we be fully freed from the Accusation of the Law, will the Gospel accuse us? *It is the Law that worketh Wrath*, Rom. 4. 15. The Gospel doth free from Wrath, though not without performing the Condition; for then it suffereth the Law to have its force, and to inflict Wrath; and that so much the more, in that so great a benefit was neglected. *Ibid.* & 75.

2. The performing of a Condition, as the Condition is a Duty, is a Righteousness; but such as cannot justifie,

as we now ſpeak of Juſtification. But as the Condition is meerly a Condition, the performing of it is not properly Righteouſneſs, though by it we partake of Righteouſneſs, *viz.* the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, by which we are juſtified.

3. Therefore this is no contradiction, to grant Faith to be the Condition of Juſtification, and yet to deny it to be the Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified.

De Satisfact. Chriſti, inter Opera Riveti Diſp. 13. §. 61.

That which you think to be moſt clear, *Vignerius* (before cited) thought moſt abſurd. *An poſſibile eſt (inquit) ut ſit Fides Inſtrumentum accipienda juſtitia, (ſeu Conditio ad obtinendam juſtitiam requiſita, ſi ita loqui libeat) & ſimul ſit ipſa, quam quærimus, juſtitia?*

Indeed you ſeem but to ſtrive about words; for here immediately you confeſs, That it is but a Subordinate Righteouſneſs, meaning (I think) that which all acknowledg, that it is but a means whereby to partake of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. And you that charge others with Self-Contradiction, ſeem not to agree with your ſelf. For here preſently after you ſay, [*This Perſonal Righteouſneſs* præſtitæ conditionis N. T. *muſt be had, before we can have that which ſheeth us from the Law*]; yet elſewhere your Expreſſions are ſuch, as if being firſt juſtified from the Accuſation of the Law, by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, we ſhould after be juſtified from the Accuſation of the Goſpel by Perſonal Righteouſneſs. However (as I have ſaid before) this latter Accuſation is but a further proſecution and confirmation of the former, by taking away the Plea that ſome might make why the Accuſation of the Law ſhould not ſtand good, and be of force to condemn them.

4. Of what force is Satans Accuſation againſt any, if he cannot make good his Accuſation, ſo as to procure his Condemnation? And are not Unbelievers and Rebels againſt Chriſt condemned by the Law? Is it not for ſin that they are condemned? And is there any ſin which is not againſt the Law? The Goſpel indeed may aggravate Sin, and increaſe Condemnation: and ſo thoſe words which you cite [*The words which I ſpeak, ſhall judg you*, &c.] may be underſtood; as thoſe are more clearly to the purpoſe *Joh.* 15. 22. *If I had not come and ſpoken unto them, they had not had ſin*, (*viz.* in ſo high degree

degree as it follows) *but now they have no cloak for their sin.* But ſtill it is by the Law that all ſinners are convinced and condemned. As for Righteouſneſs, whereby one is juſtified from a falſe Accuſation, it is but ſuch as the Devil himſelf may have, as hath been noted before, though Faith be of force to take off all Satan's Accuſations whatſoever. And when Satan doth accuſe any of not performing the Condition of the Goſpel, he doth but only ſhew that ſuch ſtand guilty by the Law, and ſo are to be condemned, as having no benefit of the Goſpel, becauſe they have not performed the Condition of it: So that ſtill it is the Law, by which Satan doth accuſe and bring to condemnation.

But by the way I obſerve, That in this place of your *Aphor.* (p. 308.) you ſay, That *Rom.* 3. 28. and 4. 2, 3, 14, 15, 16. *Paul* concludeth, that neither Faith, nor Works, is the Righteouſneſs which we muſt plead againſt the Accuſation of the Law, but the Righteouſneſs which is by Faith, *i. e.* Chriſt's Righteouſneſs: Yet before in this Writing you ſtand upon the very Letter of the Text, and will have it to prove, That Faith it ſelf properly taken is our Righteouſneſs. If you ſay that you mean our Evangelical Righteouſneſs, yet ſo you agree not with your ſelf in your *Aphoriſms*, where you make *Paul* in thoſe Texts to ſpeak of our Legal Righteouſneſs.

1. They againſt whom *James* diſputed, relied on Faith as the Condition of the New Covenant; but it was not ſuch a Faith as the New Covenant doth require, it was a Faith *renuens operas*; upon that account *James* confuted them, not as if Faith alone without Works (though yet a Faith ready to ſhew it ſelf by Works) were not the Condition of Juſtification. 75.

2. I am ſorry that *Beza*'s words, which I cited, and which to me ſeem very excellent, ſhould be ſo cenſured by you, as if there were I know not how many miſtakes in them; but truly I think the miſtakes will be found to be in your cenſure.

To your Exceptions I anſwer; 1. *Quis vel ex noſtris, vel ex Transmarinis Theologis, Fidem pro Cauſâ (nempe inſtrumentali) Juſtificationis non habet?*

2. Beza *ait, tu negas; Utri potius aſſentiendum? Quid dico Beza? Quis enim iſtud non dicit? Sed hominum authoritate nolo te obruere, rationes antè allatæ expendantur.* 3. *Affir-*

3. *Affirmas tantùm, non probas, Opera à* Jacobo *stabiliri ut Justificationis Conditiones & Media. Effecti ut effecti potest esse necessitas ad veritatem causæ comprobandam, nec aliâ ratione operum necessitas à* Jacobo *stabilitur; neque enim ad justificationem procurandam, sed ad eam duntaxat comprobandam, tanquam Justificantis Fidei fructus, Opera ut necessaria stabiliuntur, ut antea ex ipsâ Apostoli Argumentatione ostensum est.*

4. *Nec* Beza, *nec alius quisquam (quòd sciam) distinctionem istam de Justificatione Inchoatâ, & Justificatione Continuatâ, quasi sc. alia hujus, alia illius esset conditio, perspectam habuit. Hujus inventionis gloriam ego equidem tibi non invideo.*

Ibid. 1. Certain it is, All Works are not the fulfilling of the Old Law's Condition: but all Works whereby we are justified, are the fulfilling of it; and therefore (as I said in the *Animadversions*) to be justified by Works, and to be justified by the Law, are with *Paul* one and the same; See *Rivet, Disp. de Fide Justif.* §. 21. the words are before cited.

2. We are justified by the New Law, against the Accusation of the Old Law. Certainly if we be accused of Unbelief and Rebellion against Christ, we are accused of being Sinners. For are Unbelief and Rebellion against Christ no sins?

3. Who doth not so distinguish of τὸ *Credere*, except some few whom I have no mind to follow? But how will this Distinction, *inter quod opus, & quâ opus*, serve to keep in Obedience, as having a joint interest with Faith in Justification? What dark Equivocal (I pray) is this, That Faith doth justifie as that whereby we are made Partakers of Christ's Righteousness? Your self acknowledges an aptitude in Faith to justifie in this respect; and in this respect (I say) Faith is appointed to be the Condition of Justification.

Ibid. I take what you grant, *viz.* That *Paul* doth not imply Obedience as concurrent with Faith in our first Justification: that he doth imply it as concurrent in our Justification afterward, you should prove, and not content your self with the bare affirming of it. Doth not *Paul* by that *Gen.* 15. [*Abraham believed God*, &c.] prove that *Abraham* was justified by Faith without the concurrence of Obedience? Yet that was not the first time that

that *Abraham* either believed, or was justified. The truth therefore is, *Paul* implieth Obedience as the Fruit of that Faith which justifieth both at first and last, but not as concurring with Faith unto Justification either at first or last.

1. There is a necessity of Faith shewing it self by Works, that so it may appear to be such a Faith whereby Christ is truly apprehended and received. But are Works therefore Copartners with Faith in justifying, because only such a Faith doth justifie as doth also produce Works? You exclude Works from having any thing to do in our Justification at first, yet surely Works must follow as Fruits of that Faith whereby we are at first justified. *Ibid.* & 76.

2. For the Texts alledged, that *Mat.* 12. 37. [*By thy words thou shalt be justified*, &c.] is as plain you say as [*We are justified by Faith*]. But if it be so plain, it may seem wonderful, that *Bellarmine* should never make use of it, when he labours to prove, That Faith alone doth not justifie; which (so far as I observe) he doth not. Nor do the Rhemists on the place take any notice of those words, who yet are ready to catch at every thing that may but seem to make for them. Yet it seems some of our Romish Adversaries have laid hold on those words.

But hear how *Calvin* doth censure them for it; *Quod autem Papistæ ad enervandam fidei justitiam hoc torquent, puerile est.* Ad *Mat.* 12. 37.

Certainly all good that we do, may justifie *quadantenus*, so far as it is good: But can we therefore be simply and absolutely, or (if you like those terms better) fully and perfectly justified, either by our Words or Works? Those places that require forgiving of others, that so God may forgive us, shew indeed, that it is no true Justifying Faith which doth not, as occasion requires, manifest it self in that kind: but we are not therefore justified as well by forgiving others, as by believing; nor doth the forgiving of others concur with Faith unto Justification. That in 1 *John* 1. 9. and *Acts* 3. 19. shews that Repentance must go before Justification, and is required unto Justification, but not so as Faith is required.

Repen-

Multa requiruntur ad Justificationem quæ non justificant Amef. *loco ante citato.*

Repentance is required, that we may be justified, but not that we may be justified by it, as we are by Faith, though Instrumentally and Relatively, as it apprehendeth Christ's Righteousness by which we are justified. For Prayer, it is a Fruit of Faith, and therefore called, *The Prayer of Faith*, Jam. 5. 15.

[*Repentance* (saith Mr. *Ball* Of the Coven. *c.* 3. *p.* 18.) *is the Condition of Faith, and the Qualification of a Person capable of Salvation: but Faith alone is the Cause of Justification and Salvation on our part required*].

And immediately after he adds; [*It is a penitent and petitioning Faith, whereby we receive the promises of Mercy; but we are not justified, partly by Prayer, partly by Repentance, but by that Faith which stirreth up Godly sorrow for sin, and inforceth us to pray for Pardon and Salvation*].

And again; [*Prayer is nothing else but the Streame or River of Faith, and an issue of the desire of that which joyfully we believe*]. Of Faith, *Part* 1. *Chap.* 8. *pag.* 105.

For that place, *Acts* 22. 16. the Exposition which I gave of it in the *Animadversions*, is confirmed by this, That the nature of a Sacrament is to signifie and seal, as the Apostle shews, *Rom.* 4. 11.

Quatenus ergo fidem nostram adjuvat Baptismus, (inquit Calvinus) *ut remissionem peccatorum percipiat in solo Christi sanguine, Lavacrum animæ vocatur. Et ablutio, cujus meminit* Lucas, *non causam designat; sed ad sensum* Pauli *refertur, qui symbolo accepto, peccata sua esse expiata (N. B.) melius cognovit. Cum testimonium haberet* Paulus *gratia Dei, jam illi remissa erant peccata. Non igitur Baptismo demum ablutus est, sed novam gratiæ, quam adeptus erat, confirmationem accepit.*

That *Paul*'s sins were but incompletly washed away by Faith until he was baptized, your Similitudes (which are too often your only proofs) do not prove. Yea, a Kings Coronation, (of which you speak) when the Kingdom is hereditary, is (I think) but a confirmation of what was done before.

The purifying of the Heart spoken of, 1 *Pet.* 1. 22. is (I conceive) to be understood as *Jam.* 4. 8. & *Jer.* 4. 14.

viz.

viz. of purifying from the filth of sin by Sanctification. And for 1 *Pet.* 4. 18. who denies the diligence of the Righteous to be a means of their Salvation? But what is that to prove Works to concur with Faith unto Justification?

1. I take what you grant, That at first believing a Man is justified so fully, as that he is acquitted from the guilt of all Sin, and from all Condemnation. And surely at the last one can have no fuller Justification than this is. That afterwards he is acquitted from the guilt of more sins, is not to the purpose, seeing he is acquitted from all at first, and but from all at last, though this [all] be more at last than at first. Otherwise the Justification of one who hath fewer sins, should not be so full as the Justification of him, whose sins are more in number. 76, & 77.

2. That there is a further Condition of Justification afterward than at first, hath been said often, but was never yet proved.

3. That which you call Sentential Justification, (*viz.* at the Last Judgment) I hold to be only the manifestation of that Justification which was before. That because Obedience is a Condition of Salvation, heretofore it is also a Condition of Justification, I deny (as you see) all along in the *Animadversions*, and therefore I thought it enough here to touch that, which you say of full Justification, especially seeing your self hold Obedience to be no Condition of Justification at first. You lay the weight of your 78*th* Thesis upon the word [full] which therefore was enough for me to take hold of.

For your Queries therefore about Sentential Justification at Judgment, I have told you my mind before, and you might sufficiently understand it by the *Animadversions*.

When you prove, 1. that Justification at Judgment is a Justification distinct from Justification here, and not only a manifestation of it,

2. That Justification at Judgment hath the same Conditions with Salvation, as taken for the accomplishment of it, *viz.* Glorification.

And, 3. That consequently Obedience is a Condition of Justification at Judgment. When you shall prove (I say) these things, I shall see more than yet I do.

In the mean while, besides what hath been said before, hear

hear what *Bucan* saith to this purpose; *An perficitur justificatio nostra in hâc vitâ? In Justificatione quemadmodum judicamur, & reputamur à Deo justi, ita etiam adjudicamur vitæ æternæ. Ratione igitur decreti divini, & sententiæ ipsius de vitâ æternâ prolatæ à Deo judice; item ratione justitiæ, quam imputat nobis Judex Cœlestis, jam perfecta est justificatio nostra in hâc vitâ, nisi quod in altera magis patefacienda (N. B.) sit ac revelanda eadem illa justitia imputata, & arctiùs ejus nobis applicanda. Ea tamen tota perficitur in hac vitâ, in quâ potest homo dici plenè perfectèque justificatus. Filii Dei sumus (ergo justificati) sed nondum patefactum est quid erimus,* 1 John 3. 2. *At si executionem respicias, & rationem habeas vitæ, & gloriæ, quæ nobis adjudicatur, & quæ nobis inhæsura est, quia in nobis non perficitur in hâc vitâ, imperfecta etiam Justificatio in hâc vitâ censeri potest.*

Loc. 31. quæst. 46.

Non impediunt vitiis originalis residui macula illa, quin etiam in hâc vitâ perfecta sit justificatio. Qua revera nec intenditur, nec remittitur, rem ipsam quod attinet. Gataker. *contra* Gomarum. p. 26, 27.

1. I think there is not the like right of Salvation and Justification, but that although we must be saved by Works, though not by the Merit of them, yet we cannot be justified by Works, except it be by the merit of them. My reason is, Because that whereby we are justified, must fully satisfie the Law; for it must fully acquit us from all Condemnation, which otherwise by the Law will fall upon us. This Works cannot do, except they be fully conform to the Law, and so be meritorious, as far forth as the Creature can merit of the Creator. But being justified by Faith, *i. e.* by the Righteousness of Christ through Faith imputed to us, and so put into a state of Salvation, we must yet shew our Faith by our Works; which though they be imperfect, and so not meritorious, yet make way for the full enjoyment of Salvation. And me-thinks the Scripture is so frequent and clear in distinguishing betwixt Justification and Salvation, as to the full enjoyment of it, that it may seem strange that you should so confound them as you do, and argue as if there were the same reason of the one as of the other.

2. You might easily see, that by [*Via Regni*] as opposed to [*Causa Regnandi*]; I meant only to exclude the Merit of Works, not to deny Works to be a Means and

and a Condition required of us for the obtaining of compleat Salvation. Salvation is a Chain consisting of many Links, but so is not Justification; it is but one Link of that Chain.

3. If all the World of Divines be against this, That Justification at Judgment is but a Declaration of our Justification here; I have hitherto (it seems) been in some other World. For truly (so far as I observe) both Scripture and Divines usually speak of Justification, as we here partake of it. As for Justification at Judgment, it is but rarely touched, either in Scripture or in other Writings: Neither (so far as I can see) will it consist with either, to make Justification at Judgment a compleating of our Justification, as if before we were but imperfectly justified: but rather they shew, that our Justification is then fully declared and made manifest, and that then we come to the full enjoyment of that benefit, which we have right unto by our Justification, *viz.* Glorification. *For whom he justified, them he also glorified*, Rom. 8. 30. I have spoken enough of this before; but you do so continually repeat the same things, that I am forced also to repeat things oftner than I would.

1. That Justification by Sentence, *viz.* at the Last Judgment, and Continued Justification, are several kinds of Justification distinct from Justification begun, and have several Conditions, you continually affirm, or suppose, but never prove. *Ibid.*

2. My debate with you was about those words, [*That which we are justified by, we are saved by*]; and [*the full possession or enjoyment of Salvation*]. What your reply is to the purpose, I cannot see. And besides, you had need to clear those words, [*In justifying it is the same thing to give a right to a thing, and to give the thing it self*]. For if you mean, That as soon as a right to a thing is given by Justification, the thing it self also is actually given; it appears to me far otherwise. For I think that Justification presently gives a right to Glorification; For what doth debar from that right, but sin? Now the guilt of sin is done away by Justification: therefore there is a present right too to Glorification, yet no present enjoyment of it. How I do yeeld your Assertion, you do not shew.

Ibid. Your Repetitions indeed have been troublesome unto me. I grant here more than you desire, *viz.* That not only to morrow there will be Condemnation to him that shall not sincerely obey, but even to day there is condemnation to him; his Faith being not prompt and ready to bring forth the Fruit of Obedience, is not such as doth justifie him at all. But though Faith, whereby we are justified, must and will shew it self by Works, yet we are not therefore justified by Works as well as by Faith. *Paul* doth exclude Works, as well from Justification afterward as at first, *viz.* as concurring with Faith unto the Effect of Justifying: for he shews that *Abraham* was justified, not only at first, but also afterward, by Faith and not by Works, *Rom.* 4. 2. 3. And *James* doth require Works as well to Justification at first as afterward, *viz.* as Fruits of that Faith whereby we are justified. For otherwise he saith it is a dead Faith, ineffectual and unprofitable. Though Works do not presently appear upon our first believing, yet if they do not appear in due season, that Faith doth not justifie; Such a Believer doth not cease to be, but indeed never was in Christ, *viz.* as a justified Person is in him.

Ibid. How is Justification at Judgment a declaring of a Righteousness in question? The Word of God (the truth whereof is unquestionable) assures us that all true Believers are justified. And that such and such were true Believers, God by his Word and Spirit did evidence unto them before, though then he will make it more fully evident unto all! That Satan shall publickly accuse at the Last Judgment, is more than I see either Scripture or Reason for. He shall then be judged himself, and that in some sort by the Saints, 1 *Cor.* 6. 3. He shall then have little courage to accuse the Saints, though now he doth it.

Yet I question also whether Satan do at any time directly put up unto God any Accusations against the Saints. He seems to be called *the Accuser of the Brethren*, *Apoc.* 12. 10. because by his Instruments he is ever * traducing and slandering them. He is said to accuse them, ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, before God, or in the sight of God; not τῷ Θεῷ, unto God, as the unjust Steward was accused to his Master, διεβλήθη αὐτῷ, *Luk.* 16. 1. That in

* See Mr. *Mede* on the place.

In *Job* 1. & 2. seems to be parabolically expressed. Satan knows his Accusations against the Saints to be false: Therefore he knows it is to little purpose to accuse them unto God. Especially at the Last Judgment, by the very separating of the Elect from the Reprobate, he will see that it is in vain to bring any Accusation against the Elect: and therefore how there should then be any such publick Accuser, or any question of the Righteousness of the Saints, I do not see: besides, that excepting those who will be found alive at Christ's coming, all have received their doom before, though not so openly as then they shall. That Obedience is a Condition of Glorification, not of right unto it, but of possession and enjoyment of it, I here and every-where confess.

1. What mean you by those words, [*Doth Obedience get Faith?*] Doth any such thing follow, upon that which I say? But you say, [*If Obedience only manifest Faith, how then doth it procure Right?*] *Ibid.* & 78.

Answ. It is not said, That Obedience doth procure right, but only thus much is signified, That none can have right without Obedience, as the Fruit of that Faith by which right is procured. As I said before of Works, so I say now of keeping the Commandments, (which doth comprehend in it all good Works) it is spoken of only as a Fruit of Faith, which Faith indeed doth (Instrumentally and Relatively) procure Right.

For the words of *James* I have said enough before; I have neither list nor leisure to repeat the same things continually upon every occasion. What your multitude of other Texts is, I do not know; but if they be not more forced, than by my Opinion the words of *James* are, there will be little cause to complain of the forcing of them.

2. That Faith without Obedience doth give right at first, you grant: The same right (I hold) is still continued only by Faith; though Faith, if not of such a Nature as to produce Obedience, can neither give right at first, nor afterward continue it. Though Repentance must go before Justification, yet Faith alone may justifie, and so give right; which though it be not the same with Justifying, yet it is necessarily joined with it.

3. *Jus in re*, I take to be such a Right, as from which the Possession it self is not, nor can be separated.

4. The Text doth not ascribe *Jus ad rem* to Obedience, but only *Declarativè*: as a Fruit of Faith it maketh it appear, that there is such a Right which Faith hath procured.

5. I do indeed believe, That a Man may have, and hath *Jus ad Gloriam* without Obedience, even as he is justified without Obedience. For certainly as soon as a Man is justified, he hath *Jus ad Gloriam*. For what doth hinder but sin, the guilt of which by Justification is done away? Yet still I say, Faith which doth justifie, and so gives right to Glory, will shew it self by Obedience. Those words [*If he live to Age*] are needless: for we speak continually of the Justification of such as are of Age. But how can you seriously ask me this Question, when your self put it out of all question, holding that a Man (that is of Age, I presume) is at first justified, and consequently (as I think you will not deny) hath *Jus ad Gloriam*, by Faith without Obedience?

6. It is no debasing of Faith to say, That after it, as a Fruit of it, Obedience is required to give *Jus in re*, *i. e.* to bring into the actual possession of Glory. How can you pretend this to be a debasing of Faith, who debase it much more in making it unsufficient to give *Jus ad rem*, except there be Obedience concurrent with it? Though yet herein you do not keep fair correspondence with your self, without a distinction of *Jus Inchoatum*, and *Jus Continuatum*; which distinction how it will hold good, I do not see.

78. If any shall think that you have said enough to prove, That we are justified by a Personal Righteousness, I shall think that such are soon satisfied.

Ibid. 1. When we speak of Justification, we speak of it as taking off all Accusation, and as opposed to all Condemnation. And what Righteousness is sufficient for this, but that which is perfect?

2. That *Lud. de Dieu* hath not the same Doctrine on *Rom.* 8. 4. as you deliver, I have sufficiently shewed before: And if he had, I take the Authority of *Calvin* and *Davenant* (whom I cited, and to whom many others might be added) to be of more force against it, than *de Dieus*

Dien's could be for it. That Holineſs and Obedience is neceſſary unto Salvation, ſo that no Salvation is to be expected without it, it were pitty (as I ſaid in the *Animadverſions*) any ſhould deny: but to argue from Salvation to Juſtification, Dr. *Fulk* told the *Rhemiſts*, is Pelting Sophiſtry: Yet you ſeem to wonder that I make a great difference between the Condition of Juſtification, and the Condition of Salvation. As for Right to Salvation that's another thing: as Faith alone doth juſtifie, ſo it alone gives Right to Salvation: Yet becauſe this Faith is of a working Nature, therefore before the actual Enjoyment of Salvation, Faith, as occaſion doth require, will ſhew it ſelf by Obedience; and that is all which the Apoſtle teacheth *Rom.* 8. 13. On *Jam.* 2. 24.

Verum eſt quidem (ſaith *Calvin*) *nos ſolâ Dei miſericordiâ juſtificari in Chriſto: ſed aquè & iſtud verum ac certum, omnes qui juſtificantur vocari à Domino, ut dignè ſuâ vocatione vivant.* Ad Loc.

It is true, He that proved a Man lived not after the fleſh, but mortified it, doth juſtifie him from that Accuſation, That he is worthy of Death: but that is only, becauſe a Man's not living after the fleſh, but mortifying it, proves the truth of his Faith, whereby he hath intereſt in Chriſt, and ſo is freed from all Condemnation, as the Apoſtle clearly ſheweth *Rom.* 8. 1. If that be a *Reatus* to make Faith only the Condition of Juſtification, yet Obedience alſo a Condition of Glorification. I ſay with the Orator, *Quod maximè accuſatori optandum eſt, habes confitentem reum*: But what *Reatus* there is in this, I do not ſee, nor could our choiceſt Divines (it ſeems) ſee any in it.

Rivet ſaith, that *Opera ſequuntur Juſtificationem, ſed præcedunt Glorificationem*; the words were cited more at large before. *Colleg. Controverſ. Diſp.* 36.

So *Ameſius*; *Nos non negamus bona opera ullam relationem ad ſalutem habere: habent enim relationem adjuncti conſequentis, & effecti ad ſalutem* (*ut loquuntur*) *adeptam, & adjuncti antecedentis ac diſponentis ad ſalutem adipiſcendam.* *Contra Bellar. tom.* 4. *l.* 6. *c.* 6. *in initio.*

Thus alſo *Davenant*, (*De Juſtit. Actual. cap.* 32. *ſub initio*;) *Verum eſt, nos negare bona opera requiri, ut Conditiones Salutis noſtræ, ſi per bona opera intelligamus*

mus exactè bona, & quæ Legis rigori reſpondeant: ſi etiam per Conditiones ſalutis intelligamus Conditiones fœderis, quibus recipimur in favorem Dei, & ad jus (N.B.) æternæ vitæ. Hæc enim pendent ex ſolâ conditione fidei Chriſtum Mediatorem apprehendentis. At falſum eſt, nos negare bona opera requiri, ut Conditiones ſalutis, ſi per bona opera intelligamus illos fructus inchoatæ juſtitiæ, quæ ſequuntur juſtificationem, & (N.B.) præcedunt glorificationem, ut via ordinata ad eandem.

What ſome Divines in their private Conteſts with you may do I know not; I ſhew what eminent Divines in their publick Writings do deliver, even the ſame that I maintain, *viz.* That Faith alone is the Condition of Juſtification, and of right to Salvation and Glory: and yet that Works are alſo requiſite as the Fruits of that Faith, and as making way for the actual enjoyment of Glory.

For the term [*Inſtrument*], I was not willing to wrangle about it, neither am I willing to ſtrive about words. Yet I told you, I thought it might well enough be uſed as our Divines do uſe it. And I always let you know, That thô perhaps Faith may more fitly be called a Condition, yet not ſo as to make it to be merely *Cauſa ſine quâ non*, but ſo as to aſcribe ſome Cauſality and Efficiency unto it in reſpect of Juſtification, *viz.* in that it apprehendeth and receiveth Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; by which through Faith imputed unto us we are juſtified.

Of the Coven. c.6.p.70. [*Faith* (ſaith Mr. *Ball*) *is not a bare Condition, without which the thing cannot be,* (*for that is no cauſe at all*) *but an Inſtrumental Cauſe*, &c.]

This (as you might ſee by many Paſſages) is the very reaſon why (I think) the Scripture doth attribute Juſtification to Faith alone, and not to Works, nor any other Grace beſides Faith; becauſe only Faith doth embrace Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs. Though therefore I neither was, nor am willing λογομαχεῖν, yet I neither did, nor do diſclaim the word [*Inſtrument*] as unmeet to be uſed.

And indeed ſeeing Faith hath ſome Cauſality in Juſtifying, what Cauſe it ſhould be rather than Inſtrumental, I do not know.

Hear

Hear Mr. *Ball* again, if you please, [*If when we speak of the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace, by Condition we understand whatsoever is required on our part, as precedent, concomitant, and subsequent to Justification, Repentance, Faith and Obedience are all Conditions: but if by Condition we understand what is on our part required as the Cause of the good promised, though only Instrumental, Faith or Belief in the Promise is the only Condition*]. Of the Coven. c. 3. p. 20.

And again; [*Faith is a necessary and lively Instrument of Justification, which is among the number of true Causes, not being a Cause without which the thing is not done, but a Cause whereby it is done. The Cause without which a thing is not done, is only present in the action, and doth nothing therein; but as the Eye is an active Instrument for Seeing, and the Ear for Hearing; so is Faith also for Justifying. If it be demanded whose Instrument it is? It is the Instrument of the Soul, wrought therein by the Holy Ghost, and is the free Gift of God*]. Ibid. p. 19.

So *Amesius* when *Bellarmine* objected; *Sacramenta promissiones applicant, & nostras faciunt! non ergo per modum instrumenti applicantis fides sola justificat.* Contra Bell. tom. 4 lib. 5. c. 4. ad 11.

He answers; *Sola tamen ex iis, quæ sunt in nobis, vel à nobis erga Deum: sola fides accipiendo: quia Sacramenta sunt à Deo erga nos, & Promissionem applicant, ut instrumenta dando, non accipiendi.*

Thus then is Faith taken for an Instrument of Justification, in that by Faith we receive the Promise, or Christ promised, by whom we are justified.

Bellarmine again objecting; *Hoc non multum refert: nam utrumque est instrumentum Dei.*

He answers; *Plurimum refert, quia sicut Sacramenta quamvis aliquo sensu possint dici instrumenta nostra, quatenus per illa tanquam per media assequimur finem nostrum, propriè tamen sunt instrumenta Dei: sic etiam Fides, quamvis possit vocari instrumentum Dei, quia Deus justificat nos ex fide & per fidem*, Rom. 3. 20. *propriè tamen est instrumentum nostrum. Deus nos baptizat, & pascit, non nosmetipsi; nos credimus in Christum, non Deus.*

If you desire more to this purpose, besides what hath been said before, I refer you to Mr. *Blake* of the Cove-

nant, *chap.* 12. and Mr. *Kendal* againſt Mr. *Goodwin*, chap. 4.

79. 1. The non-fulfilling of the Condition of the New-Covenant doth condemn, yet it is by the Law, and for the tranſgreſſing of it that any are condemned; there being no freedom from Condemnation, but by the New-Covenant, nor any by it without fulfilling the Condition of it. Such as do not embrace the New-Covenant, and that on the terms upon which it is made, are left to the Condemnation of the Old-Covenant, which will be ſo much the ſorer, as the Sin in deſpiſing the Mercy offered is the greater. So that ſtill (as I ſaid in the *Animadverſions*) the fulfilling of the Law, *viz.* Chriſt's fulfilling it for us, is that by which we are juſtified, though Faith be required of us, that Chriſt's fulfilling of the Law may be imputed unto us, and ſo we may be juſtified by it.

The Accuſations which you ſpeak of, *viz.* 1. Of not fulfilling the Condition of the New-Covenant. 2. Of having therefore no part in Chriſt. 3. Of being guilty moreover of far ſorer puniſhment.

All theſe Accuſations (as I have often ſaid) are but a re-inforcing of that Accuſation, That we are guilty of tranſgreſſing the Law, and ſo to be condemned; and therefore the more guilty, and the more to be condemned, becauſe freedom from that Guilt and Condemnation might have been obtained, and was neglected; ſee *Act.* 13. 38, 41. *Heb.* 2. 3.

2. The Goſpel doth not joyn Obedience with Faith as the Condition of our right unto Salvation, though it require Obedience as a Fruit of that Faith, whereby we obtain that Right, and ſo as the way or means whereby to enter into the actual enjoyment of Salvation.

3. You might ſee that I do not yeeld the Theſis, wherein you make Faith and Obedience ſo to be Conditions of the New-Covenant, as withal to be Conditions of Juſtification: This both now and every-where I deny.

Ibid. 1. If it be not much (as you ſay) to your purpoſe; Why do you alledg it? That Chriſt did not receive either of the Sacraments for that end as we receive them, who can queſtion?

2. If you judg it uncertain, whether *Luke* or *Matthew*

them did relate those words, [*I will not drink hence-forth*, &c.] out of due place, why are you so peremptory in your *Aphorisms* as to say, [*Luke doth clearly speak of two Cups, and doth subjoin these words to the first, which was before the Sacramental*]?

3. Why do you call that Supposition, [*If* Luke *had not written*] a merry one? Is it ridiculous to suppose such a thing?

Let us suppose (says Mr. *Cawdrey* and Mr. *Palmer*) *that Question had not been put to our Saviour, and that the Apostle had not written his Epistle to the* Ephesians, &c.] Of the Sabbath, Part 2. c. 6. p. 227.

May not one as well sport with this Supposition of theirs, as you with that of mine? *Luke* himself shews, That he wrote his Gospel after others, *Luk.* 1. 1. Probable it is, that he wrote after *Matthew* and *Mark*: And how should any reading only these, imagine that those words [*I will not drink*, &c.] were meant of any other than the Sacramental Cup, they not making mention (no not in appearance) of any other?

Apud Matthæum (*inquit* Amef.) 26. 29. *pronomen istud demonstrativum*, [*ex hoc fructu vitis*] *necessariò refertur ad illud, quod precedentibus verbis fuit eodem pronomine demonstratum*, [*Hoc est sanguis meus*]. *Contra* Bellar. *Tom.* 3. *l.* 4. *c.* 1. §. 48.

Though *Matthew* and *Mark* had not written, yet it had been no such boldness to suppose *Luke* to relate some words out of that order wherein they were spoken, such Anticipations (as I said, and you do not gain-say it) being usual in the Scripture.

Thus again *Amesius*; *Ex ipso* Luca (*quamvis ibi transponantur verba*) *contrà colligitur aperte, illa verba pertinere ad Calicem Mysticum & Sacramentalem Cœnæ Domini. Nam cap.* 22. 17. *dicitur Dominus gratias egisse super illud poculum, in quo dicit fructum vitis postea mansisse, eodem modo quo* v. 19. *gratias egit super panem. Hâc autem gratiarum actione intelligi benedictionem & Consecrationem Sacramentalem concedit* Bellarminus, *cap.* 10. &c. *Ibid.*

1. It is such a Justification, as the Apostle where he doth professedly treat of that Subject, doth scarce ever mention: nor yet do Divines use to speak of it. Therefore your [*totus Mundus Theologorum Reformatorum*], *Ibid.* & 80.

is

is *Vox, praterea nihil.* Why do you alledge none of them? *Juris consultos enim in hâc causâ minùs moror.* But and if we maintain the word [*Justification*] is taken *in sensu forensi*; What of that? May it not yet nevertheless be as I suppose it is, *viz.* That Justification at the Last Judgment is only a full manifestation of that Justification which we have here, and not (as you affirm) our actual, most proper and compleat Justification, as if here our Justification were but potential, less proper and incompleat?

Medul. lib. 1. *c.* 27. §. 7. *Amesius* handling this Point, saith, *Justificatio est sententia pronuntiatio, & non physicam aliquam aut realem commutationem denotat in S. literis, sed forensem aut moralem illam, quæ in Sententiæ pronuntiatione & reputatione consistit.*

Yet he hath nothing at all (that I see) of Justification at the Great Judgment; much less that it is the actual, most proper and compleat Justification.

Ibid. §. 9. He saith moreover; *Sententia hæc fuit*; 1. *in mente Dei quasi concepta per modum decreti justificandi.* 2. *Fuit in Christo capite nostro à mortuis jam resurgente pronuntiata.* 3. *Virtualiter pronuntiatur ex primâ illa relatione, quæ ex fide ingeneratâ exurgit.* 4. *Expressè pronunciatur per Spiritum Dei testantem Spiritibus nostris reconciliationem nostram cum Deo.* — *In hoc testimonio Spiritûs non tam propriè ipsa justificatio consistit, quàm actualis anteà concessæ perceptio, per actum fidei quasi reflexum.*

But as for the pronouncing of this Sentence at the Last Judgment, he doth not so much as make any mention of it. Neither doth *Calvin* (that I find) in his Institutions, though he treat at large of Justification, and that *in sensu forensi*, speak any thing of Justification at the Last Judgment; nor indeed any that I meet with, except it be on the by, as *Bucanus* and *Maccovius*, who agree with me, as I have shewed before.

2. If the Fruits of Faith be inquired after, That so Faith may appear true and genuine, such as doth indeed receive Christ, and so justifie; Is not this a sufficient reason why they are inquired after? But in that which follows about *via ad Regnum*, &c. you are quite *extra viam.* You forget that we are now about Justification;

or

or at least that I do not make the Condition of Justification and of Salvation every way the same as you sometimes do. This may suffice for your two first Objections.

To the Third and Fourth, I answer in the words of that Reverend and Learned *Davenant*; *Particula* [*Etiam*] *non semper rei causam denotat, sed illationis consequentiam, sive à causâ, sive ab effecto, sive à signo, sive undecunque petitam;* — *Sic quando Christus dicit Electis, Venite benedicti, &c. Esurivi enim, &c. particula illa non cum causâ salutis, sed cum signo causæ connectitur. Nam illa bona opera, quæ ibi recensentur, sunt signa veræ fidei, adoptionis, insitionis in Christum, prædestinationis ac favoris divini, quæ sunt vera causa salutis.* *De Justit. Habit. cap. 32. ad Object. 9.*

Maccovius *de Justific. Disp. 10. Justificatur quis ex operibus apud Deum non justificatione causæ, sed justificatione effecti & signi.*

You are therefore too free and forward in saying, That the Uses pretended for this enquiring after mere Signs are frivolous. What though the business at Judgment be to enquire of the Cause, and to sentence accordingly? May not the Cause (take it in the Law-sense) be made to appear by Signs, even as the Cause (in the Logical-sense) doth appear by the Effect, and the Tree by the Fruit? That Obedience is *ipsa Causa, de quâ quæritur*, the terms [*Therefore*] and [*Because*] do not prove, no more than the term [*For*]. And here I may with better reason say than you did, *Appello totum Mundum Theologorum Reformatorum.*

But here I must mind you of one thing, which (it seems) you do not observe, *viz.* That those terms which you build upon, [*Because*] and [*Therefore*] are neither in the Original, nor any Translation (that I know) except the Vulgar Latin, which hath *Quia.*

Bellarmine urging these Particles, *Amesius* answers, *Mat. 25. 21, 23. Nulla particula reperitur nisi in Versione non probanda. Contra* Bellar. *Tom. 4. lib. 7. cap. 2. ad 3.*

1. You cite abundance of Texts, but to what purpose? You would have me try whether they speak only of Signs, or or Conditions. Conditions of what do you mean? Of Justification? That you are to prove: but 80.

how

how it can be proved by any of those Texts, I cannot see. They speak of the necessity of Obedience unto Salvation, of God's rendring unto Men according to their Deeds, of the reward of good Works, &c. But doth it therefore follow, that Obedience and good Works are Conditions of Justification? I am loth to be so plain with you, as sometimes you are with me, otherwise I could say, I have seldom seen so many places of Scripture alledged to so little purpose. Some of those places you seem to lay more weight upon, as *John* 16. 27. and 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. and 1 *John* 3. 22, 23. For here you do not only note the places, but you also cite the words, as if they were more especially to be observed.

Now for that *Joh.* 16. 27. [*The Father hath loved you, because you have loved me*]; What do you infer from thence? That Works justifie as part of the Condition of Justification? If this be a good Consequence, I may say, *Reddat mihi minam qui me docuit Dialecticam.*

1. Works and Love differ as well as Works, though Works flow both from Love and Faith.

In Loc. *Calvin* makes those words [*because you have loved me*], to denote an unfeigned Faith, which proceedeth from a sincere Affection, here called Love. And I grant that such a Love, *viz.* of Desire doth go before Justifying Faith.

3. God doth love those that love him, and that love Christ, *amore amicitiæ*; yet *amore benevolentiæ*, he loves us before we love him, 1 *Joh.* 4. 10, 19.

Ibid. *Secundum hanc rationem* (*inquit* Calvinus) *hîc dicimur amari à Deo, dum Christum diligimus, quia pignus habemus paternæ ejus dilectionis, &c.*

That in 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. [*according to*, &c.] avails your Cause nothing. For may not Works be considered at the Last Judgment, so as that we shall receive according to them, and yet be no part of the Condition of Justification, but only Fruits of that Faith whereby we are justified? So for that in *Joh.* 3. 22. [*because we keep his Commandments*, &c.]

In Loc. I say with *Calvin*; *Non intelligit fundatam esse in operibus nostris orandi fiduciam*; *sed in hoc tantùm insistit, nim postea à fide disjungi pietatem, & sincerum Dei cultum.*

cultum. Nec abſurdum videri debet, quod particulam Cauſalem (N. B.) uſurpet, utcunque de cauſâ non diſputetur. Nam accidens inſeparabile interdum Cauſæ loco poni ſolet. Quemadmodum ſiquis dicat, Quia Sol Meridie ſupra nos lucet, plus tunc eſſe caloris. Neque enim ſequitur ex luce oriri calorem.

1. You ſhall confound Juſtification and Salvation, betwixt which (you know) I make a great difference. *Ibid.*

2. I ſee not that any of the Texts alledged do prove Obedience to be concurrent with Faith unto Juſtification, or to Right to Salvation. Obedience is an Argument *à poſteriore* of our Right unto Salvation, and *à priore* a means of our enjoyment of it. More than this by any Text of Scripture (I preſume) will not be proved.

Your Firſt and Second have nothing but mere Words. *Ibid.*

Ad 3. I anſwer, No more is the word [*Juſtification*] in any of the Texts which you cited.

Ad 4. What trick do you mean? Or what prejudice? Do you ſo wonder at this, That I cannot be perſwaded by any of your Allegations, that we are juſtified by our perſonal Righteouſneſs? Or that Works concur with Faith unto Juſtification, as being part of the Condition that the Goſpel doth require, that thereby we may be juſtified? Then all Proteſtant Divines are Men to be wondred at, or at leaſt never conſidered the Texts, which you alledg; and ſurely that were a great wonder.

Ad 5. For Juſtification at Judgment, I will ſay no more until I ſee more proof of your Opinion about it.

Ad 6. The Qualifications ſpoken of tend to that end, That we may enjoy Salvation, but not that we may have right to Salvation: They only manifeſt that Right, which by Faith in Chriſt we do obtain.

Ad 7. Of *James* his words enough already.

Ad 8. I wiſh you were more Argumentative, and leſs Cenſorious, or at leaſt more wary in expreſſing your cenſure. To ſay [*It is next to non-ſenſe*] is over-broad; If you had ſaid, That you could ſee no good ſenſe in it, this had not been ſo much, as truly I cannot in your words. For may not a thing be ſpoken by way of Sentence, and yet by way of Argumentation too? I think, Yes, when a reaſon is given of the Sentence. But what

ſhould

should that in *Luke* 19. 17. force me to confess? That Works are more than Fruits of Faith, by which we are justified?

Why do you stand so much upon the word [*Because*], when as you acknowledg that Works are no proper cause? May it not be said, [This is a good Tree, because it bringeth forth good Fruit?] and yet the goodness of the Tree is before the goodness of its Fruit: and this is but only a manifestation of the other. So what should I see in *Luk.* 19. 27? That none should be saved by Christ, but such as are obedient unto him, that I see; but not that Obedience is that whereby we are (at least in part) justified. Yea, I think it worthy your consideration, That the Texts which you alledg and build upon, speaking only of Works and Obedience, and not of Faith at all, either must be interpreted, That Obedience and Works are necessary Fruits of Justifying Faith, or else they will reach further than you would have them, even to make Obedience and Works the only Condition of Justification at Judgment.

Ad 9. Where you performed that, I know not: But however your Work was not to overthrow any Arguments for Merits, (for which I am far from urging) but to answer my reason, which I urged, why those Scriptures which you alledged, might rather seem to make Works meritorious of Salvation, than to concur with Faith unto Justification, *viz.* because they follow Justification, but go before Salvation. I know you will say, That they go before Justification as Continued and Consummate at Judgment: but for the overthrowing of that, I need say no more till you say more in defence of it.

81. The Texts which you alledg speak only of Obedience: and so if you will think to prove by them, That Obedience is the Condition of our Justification; you may as well say, That it is the only Condition, and so quite exclude Faith, which is not mentioned in those Texts. If you say, It is in other Texts; so (say I) do other Texts shew that Faith is the only Condition, and that Obedience is not concurrent with Faith unto Justification, though it necessarily flow from that Faith by which we are justified. That may be alledged as the reason of the Justifying Sentence, which yet is but the Fruit and Effect

of

of Justifying Faith. If *Sententia* be *Præmii Adjudicatio*, then (I think) *Causa Sententiæ* must be also *Causa Præmii adjudicati*. The word [*For*], when we say [*Justified for Faith*], must note either the formal, or the meritorious Cause: the *ratio Sententiæ* may be drawn from that, which is neither the formal nor the meritorious Cause of Justification, nor yet a Condition or Instrument of it, but only a Fruit and Effect of that which is so.

3. The Scripture doth not say, That Works do justifie us in that sense as you take it, *viz.* as joint Conditions with Faith of Justification.

4. I think it not so proper to say, [We must be judged, and receive our Reward by our Works] as [according to our Works]. And however, to be judged by our Works, is not as much as to be justified by them, otherwise than as they are Fruits and Effects of Faith, and so manifest our Interest in Christ, by whom all that believe are justified, *Acts* 13. 39.

5. Your [*For*] must needs be the same with [*Propter*]. When you say, [*We are justified for Faith*] surely in Latin it must be *propter Fidem*. Here [*enim*] will not be suitable.

1. That which I intimated is this, That in respect of God, such an outward judicial Proceeding needed not, no more than God doth need a Sign. Whether the Judicial Proceeding be all upon mere Signs, and the *Ipsa Causa Justitiæ* not meddled with, is not to the purpose. Though why may not that which is in some respect *Justitia Causæ*, and so *Justitia Personæ quoad istam Causam*, be *Signum Fidei, & per consequens Justitia Christi nobis per Fidem imputatæ, qua simpliciter & absolutè justificamur*? *Ibid.*

2. and 3. That which is the Condition of Glorification, is not therefore the Condition of Justification, or of right to Glorification, which doth immediately flow from Justification, or at least is inseparably joined with it. No Man can be accused to be *Reus Pœnæ*, and so to have no right to Glorification; but he that is accused to be *Reus Culpæ*: and from that Accusation we are justified by Faith, which is made manifest by our Works.

1. I perceive I did mistake your meaning, the contexture *Ibid.*

ture of your words being ſuch, that one might eaſily miſtake the meaning of them.

2. Your Affirmation is no Proof; and as well may you ſay, That becauſe in other places of Scripture the Righteous are uſually ſpoken of in reſpect of Perſonal Righteouſneſs, in oppoſition to the wicked and ungodly, therefore all thoſe places prove, That Perſonal Righteouſneſs is that whereby we are juſtified. Becauſe we muſt have a Righteouſneſs inherent in us, as well as a Righteouſneſs imputed to us; are we therefore juſtified as well by the one as the other? *Appello Evangelium pariter ac totum Mundum Theologorum Reformatorum.*

Ibid. & 82. 1. Your *Aphoriſms* tend to prove Juſtification by Works, to which end you preſs the words of St. *James*, and reject the Interpretation which our Divines give of them.

2. *Paul* indeed and *James* did not conſider Works in the ſame ſenſe. For *Paul* conſidered them as concurring with Faith unto Juſtification, and ſo rejected them: but *James* looked at them as Fruits of Juſtifying-Faith, and ſo aſſerted the neceſſity of them. You do not rightly underſtand *Paul*'s words, *Rom.* 4. 4. of which I have ſpoken before. He doth not ſpeak abſolutely; for ſo he ſhould quite aboliſh Works, which in other places he doth maintain and plead for, as without which we muſt not think to be ſaved: but he ſpeaks in reference to Juſtification, and ſo he excludes Works even for this very reaſon, becauſe they cannot juſtifie, except they be meritorious, and ſuch as that the reward of them is of debt, and not of Grace, *viz.* pardoning Grace; for otherwiſe whatever reward the Creator doth beſtow upon the Creature, it is of Grace. Yet it doth not therefore follow that Faith is meritorious, becauſe we are juſtified by Faith. For Faith doth juſtifie Relatively, in reſpect of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, which it apprehendeth, and by which ſo apprehended we are juſtified: but ſo Works cannot juſtifie; they muſt either juſtifie for their own worth, or not at all, ſave only *Declarative*, by manifeſting our Faith, and ſo our Juſtification. See Mr. *Ball* of the Coven. *c.* 3. *p.* 19. & *c.* 6. *p.* 69, 70.

Ubi (inquit) Sunt opera, illis debitum præmium expenditur quod datur fidei, gratuitum eſt. Calvin. *Inſtit. lib.* 3. *c.* 11. §. 18. *vide ibid. plura.*

1. The

1. The Scriptures do plainly ſo diſtinguiſh, as to deny Working, that thereby we may be juſtified, *Rom.* 3. 28. and 4. 5. Yet to aſſert, Working, that thereby we may be ſaved, *Phil.* 2. 12. You will ſay, That the former places ſpeak of Meritorious and Legal Working. 81.

But, 1. All Working which is good, is Legal, as I have ſhewed before, *i. e.* according to the Rule and Preſcript of the Law, even Goſpel-Obedience is in that reſpect Legal. And when the Apoſtle doth exclude the Deeds of the Law from Juſtification, he doth not mean (as ſome take it) Deeds done by the Power of the Law, without Grace, but Deeds which the Law doth preſcribe however done. For he denies that *Abraham* was juſtified by his Works; yet doubtleſs they were not done without Grace.

The Apoſtle taketh it as granted, That all Works whereby we are juſtified, are meritorious: for if there be no meritoriouſneſs in them, he ſuppoſeth there is no being juſtified by them. For indeed how can Working juſtifie, if there be any defect and failing in it? Therefore Faith it ſelf doth not juſtifie in reſpect of it ſelf, but in reſpect of Chriſt whom it apprehendeth. See *Calvin Inſt. lib. 3. cap.* 11. §. 7. the words were before-cited.

To your Second; I have always denied that there is the ſame reaſon of Salvation (*viz.* compleat) and Juſtification; and have always held, That Juſtification at Judgment is but a manifeſtation of our preſent Juſtification.

To your Third; None is *Reus Pœnæ*, except he be *Reus Culpæ*; and there is no *Reatus Culpæ*, but by tranſgreſſing the Law, though it may be aggravated, and ſo the other, by the Goſpel. But properly the not-fulfilling of the Condition of the Goſpel, taking it merely as a Condition, and not as a Duty, doth not bring a new Guilt, but only leaves a Man in the old Guilt, with an aggravation of it, he having no benefit of the Goſpel to free him from his Guilt, and being the more deeply guilty, in that he neglected the Mercy which he might have obtained.

Ibid. 1. Some of your words (I confeſs) I do not underſtand, nor can I ſee what reference they have to mine in the *Animadverſions*. But when you ſpeak of Right to Juſtification and Salvation, you ſeem to mean Sentential Juſtification at Judgment. For elſe we have here Juſtification it ſelf, and not only a right unto it, though we have only a right to Salvation, and not Salvation it ſelf; I mean in reſpect of the fulneſs and perfection of it. And though Juſtification and Salvation flow from the ſame Covenant, yet there is more required unto Salvation, than unto Juſtification by that Covenant: and ſo you alſo hold in reſpect of your firſt Juſtification.

2. You trouble your ſelf more than needs with your Diſtinctions, which (as you do uſe them) do but involve the Matter in more obſcurity. Surely my words of themſelves, [Freedom from all ſin in reſpect of imputation, and from all condemnation for ſin] are far more perſpicuous, than when you ſo multiply Diſtinctions to find out (forſooth) the meaning of them. For, 1. Is not [Freedom] more plain than [Liberation ?] though they both ſignifie the ſame thing. 2. Can there be an Active Liberation without a Paſſive, or a Paſſive without an Active ? If God free us, are we not freed ? And if we be freed, doth not God free us ? What need then to diſtinguiſh in that manner ? If freedom relate to God, it is Active; if to us, it is Paſſive. And what difference betwixt Liberation, or Freedom, (*viz.* from the Imputation of Sin, and Condemnation for Sin) and Abſolution ?

3. The Reprobate are *Condemnati per ſententiam Judicis*, Joh. 3. 18. *etiamſi ſententia publica prolatio, ejuſque plena executio in ultimum uſque diem ſit dilata.*

4. Not only right to Abſolution, but Abſolution it ſelf is perfect to a Believer through Chriſt, *Rom.* 8. 1. Neither are there any more Conditions of Juſtification at any time than Faith: though more ſins be every day committed, and ſo more are to be pardoned, yet ſtill Faith as well afterward as at firſt doth procure the pardon of them, without Works, as therein concurrent with it.

Now

Non aliam Juſtitiam (ſaith *Calvin*) *ad finem uſque vitæ habent fideles, quàm qua illic* (*nempe* Rom. 4. & 2 Cor. 5.) *deſcribitur.* *Inſtit. l 3. c.14.S.11.*

5. Actual Abſolution, and Judicial *per ſententiam Judicis*, is in this life, and that perfect, though there be not a perfect declaration of it till the Laſt Judgment.

6. When you ſay, [*Condemnation is not perfect, if any at all, till the Laſt Judgment*], you do in effect queſtion whether there be any Juſtification till then. For if no Condemnation, then no Juſtification. But Condemnation * (I ſay) is perfect here, though the Sentence be not publickly pronounced, and fully executed till hereafter.

* *I ſpeak of the Reprobate, who neither do, nor ever ſhall believe.*

7. I do not ſpeak of freedom from all ſin as the Antihomians do, as if God did ſee no ſin in his Children, and they had no ſin to be humbled for: but I ſay, That God doth not impute ſin unto them, ſo as to condemn them for it. And ſo much ſurely the Scripture doth ſay, if I underſtand it, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *Rom.* 8. 1. For freedom from future ſins, I have ſaid enough before.

8. The word [Juſtification] may be uſed *in ſenſu Judiciario*, (as I have ſhewed before) and yet Juſtification at Judgment be but a manifeſtation of our preſent Juſtification. Your Quotations out of the *Civilians* are not againſt me, for I ſay, *Sententia Judicis jam lata eſt, etiamſi in extremo demum die plenè publicéque ſit revelanda.* I ſpeak alſo of an Authoritative Manifeſtation; and therefore your Inſtance of a Woman manifeſting a Felony, *&c.* is not to the purpoſe.

Obedience as a Fruit of Faith is neceſſary, both *neceſſitate præcepti*, ſo that it is ſin to omit it; and alſo *neceſſitate medii*, ſo that we cannot be ſaved without it. But if it be a Means, (ſay you) then it is a Condition. Well, but a Means and a Condition (ſay I) of what? Of Salvation? It is granted. Of Juſtification? It is denied, neither doth this follow upon the other. 83.

Taking Chriſt for Lord is virtually included in taking him for Prieſt; ſee *Rom.* 14. 9. and 2 *Cor.* 5. 15. They cannot be divided, though they be diſtinguiſhed. That *Ibid.*

Faith which receiveth Christ as Prieſt, doth alſo receive him as Lord, either expreſly, if Chriſt be propounded as Lord, or at leaſt implicitly: yet Faith only, as receiving Chriſt as Prieſt, doth juſtifie, for the reaſon alledged before, to which I ſee nothing that you have ſaid of force to refel it. Wicked Men cannot unfeignedly receive Chriſt as Prieſt, whiles they retain a Heart ſtanding out in rebellion againſt Chriſt as Lord. Can they indeed embrace Chriſt as ſatisfying for them, and yet not yeeld up themſelves in obedience unto him?

The Apoſtle (it ſeems) was of another mind; [*The love of Chriſt* (ſaith he) *conſtraineth us. For we thus judg, That if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they which live, ſhould not henceforth live unto themſelves, but unto him that died for them, and roſe again*]. 2 Cor. 5. 14, 15.

And again, [*I am crucified with Chriſt, nevertheleſs I live; yet not I, but Chriſt liveth in me; and the life which I now live, I live by Faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himſelf for me*], Gal. 2. 20.

This is the nature of that Faith which doth receive Chriſt as a Reconciler, to work through Love, *Gal.* 5. 6. May I not retort upon you, and ſay, When you have taught wicked Men, that Faith alone doth juſtifie at firſt, and they are willing to believe, will you perſwade them that they are unjuſtified again, becauſe Works do not follow after? For my part, I know no unjuſtifying of thoſe who are once juſtified. You ſpeak ſometimes of being juſtified to day by Faith without Works, and of being unjuſtified to morrow, or the day after, except Works come in and help to juſtifie. But I ſay, Faith without a promptitude to Works doth not juſtifie at firſt; ſuch as do not receive Chriſt as Lord, and do good Works, when there is opportunity, were never juſtified at all, they never had a true Juſtifying-Faith, which is never without Works, as the ſeaſonable Fruits and Effects of it: Yet Faith both at firſt and laſt doth juſtifie without Works, as concurrent with it unto Juſtification. What you ſay of a willingneſs to receive Chriſt, is nothing. For I ſpeak of a true actual receiving, which I ſay cannot be of Chriſt as Prieſt, except it be (either expreſly or implicitly) of Chriſt as Lord alſo: and yet we are juſtified by receiving him

him in the one respect, and not in the other. None can have that Faith which justifieth, but they shall have also other Graces and VVorks of Obedience in their season; Yet do not other Graces therefore, or VVorks justifie as well as Faith.

Bellarmine objecting; *Fides vera potest res sa à dilectione separari.* Contra Bellar.

Amesius answers; *Aliqua fides potest; talis est Pontificia: sed illa fides, cui nos tribuimus justificandi virtutem, cum unionem faciat nostri cum Christo, à Christi Spiritu vivificante, & Sanctificante non potest separari.* Tom. 4. lib. 5. c. 4. ad 8.

Yet he saith; *Fides non justificat, ut respicit praecepta operum faciendorum, sed solummodo ut respicit promissionem gratiae.* Ibid. cap. 3. §. 6.

So Dr. *Prideaux*; *Fides sola justificat, non ratione existentiae, absque spe & charitate, sed muneris. Lect. 5. de Justif.* §. 7.

And Mr. *Ball* of the Coven. *c. 6. p. 73.* [Abraham *was justified by Faith alone; but this Faith, though alone in the Act of Justification, no other Grace co-working with it, was not alone in existence, did not lie dead in him, as a dormant and idle quality.* —— * *Works then (or a purpose to walk with God) justifie as the passive qualification of the Subject, capable of Justification, or as the qualification of that Faith which justifieth; or as they testifie or give proof that Faith is lively: but Faith alone justifieth, as it embraceth the promise of free forgiveness in Jesus Christ*].

* *Those words you alledg afterwards, but they are little to your purpose.*

Here by the way observe how *Amesius* and Mr. *Ball* speak of Faith apprehending and embracing the Promise; which manner of speech may also be observed in other eminent Divines, yet you somewhere censure Mr. *Cotton* somewhat sharply for speaking in that manner.

1. If it be as difficult for the Understanding to believe, (*i. e.* assent unto) Christ's Priestly Office, as is his Kingly, then it seems also as hard for the VVill to consent to, or accept of the one as the other. If the VVill be inclined to a thing, it will move the Understanding to assent unto it. *Quod valde volumus, fac lè credimus.* That the Jews believed neither Christ's Kingly nor his Ibid. & 84.

Prieſtly Office, was the perverſneſs of their Will, as well as the error of their Underſtanding. What the Papiſts, with whom you have met, do ſay, matters little; we ſee what their great Rabbies ſay and maintain in their Diſputations. Yet it is no ſtrange thing, if even they alſo now and then let fall ſomething, wherein they give teſtimony to the Truth, though in the whole current of their Diſcourſes they oppoſe it.

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. lib 6. c. 1. ad 22. *Ameſius* ſheweth, That *Bellarmine* in that very place which you cite, doth contradict himſelf, whiles he is over-earneſt to contradict Proteſtants; *Bellarminus hic implicat ſeipſum contradictione, ut nobis poſſit contradicere.*

Whereas you cite *Rivet* diſclaiming that which *Bellarmine* maketh to be the Opinion of Proteſtants, *viz.* That Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is the formal Cauſe of Juſtification, I have ſaid enough about it before, *viz.* That ſome underſtanding the Term one way, ſome another, our Divines expreſs themſelves variouſly; yet all agree in the thing it ſelf, *viz.* That Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, through Faith imputed unto us, is that by which we are juſtified; See *Davenant de Juſtit. Habit. cap. 24. ad 5.* where he anſwers this very Argument of *Bellarmine*, though he contract his words, and leave out thoſe which you cite; but however, both there, and in other places which I cited before, he hath enough to this purpoſe, concerning the formal Cauſe of Juſtification, and how the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us may be ſo termed.

Lect. 5. De Juſtif. §. 11. Dr. *Prideaux* alſo (I ſee) is offended at *Bellarmine* for ſaying, *Sed ita imputari nobis Chriſti juſtitiam, ut per eam formaliter juſti nominemur, & ſimus, id, nos cum recta ratione pugnare contendimus*; as if this were the Opinion of Proteſtants.

At quis unquam è noſtris (ſaith the Doctor) *non per juſtitiam Chriſti imputatam, formaliter juſtificari aſſeruit?*

But ſee how and in what ſenſe he doth diſclaim that Opinion; *Annon formam quamlibet inhærentem, qua formaliter juſti denominemur, ſemper exploſimus?*

In this ſenſe alſo *Davenant* doth reject it; *Quod dicit* Bellarminus, *impoſſibile eſſe, ut, per juſtitiam Chriſti imputatam formaliter juſti ſimus, ſi per formaliter intelligat*

telligat inhærenter, nugas agit, atque tribuit illam ipsam sententiam Proteſtantibus, quam oppugnant. De Juſtif. Habit. cap. 24. ad 5. Yet in another ſenſe he holds that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs imputed to us, is the formal Cauſe of our Juſtification; the words were before cited.

And as others, ſo Dr. *Prideaux* ſpeaks the very ſame thing, ſaying, *Juſtificamur per juſtitiam Chriſti, non perſona, quâ ipſe eſt veſtitus, ſed meriti, quâ ſuos veſtit, nobis imputatam.* *Ubi ſupra.*

But for the principal thing intended in this Section of yours, Though wicked Men may be more ready to receive Chriſt as their Juſtifier, than as their Ruler, (ſo you expreſs it); yet it follows not, that the receiving of Chriſt as a Ruler, is that Act of Faith which doth juſtifie. For the difficulty of a thing is no good Argument to prove the neceſſity of it, either at all, or to ſuch a purpoſe.

2. My ſecond Note was to this purpoſe, quite to take away the force of your Argument, and ſo (I think) it doth notwithſtanding your Reply. For have we not God's means to overcome that averſneſs of nature, if the receiving of Chriſt as Lord do neceſſarily follow Pardon, as well as if it be a Condition of Pardon? When I make it a Fruit of Juſtifying-Faith to take Chriſt for Lord, I do not ſay but that Chriſt may at once be received both as Prieſt and as Lord, and ſo muſt, if he be ſo propounded; I ſpeak of expreſs propounding and receiving: But my meaning is, That though we be juſtified by receiving Chriſt as Prieſt, perhaps not yet hearing of him (expreſly) as Lord, yet that Juſtifying-Faith will alſo put forth it ſelf to take Chriſt for Lord, when he is ſo ſet forth unto us. To be juſtified before we take Chriſt as Lord, is not to be juſtified before we take Chriſt as Chriſt. For Chriſt is Chriſt as Prieſt, though not only as Prieſt. Indeed to receive Chriſt in reſpect of one Office, ſo as to refuſe him in reſpect of another, were not to receive Chriſt as Chriſt: but that is not the Caſe as I do put it. And for the moral neceſſity of taking Chriſt as Lord, which you ask what it is, if it be not a Condition: I ſuppoſe it may be morally neceſſary as a thing commanded, and yet be no Condition of Juſtification. For

can nothing be commanded, and so be morally necessary, but it must be commanded and be necessary to that end, that thereby we may be justified? Works are commanded, and so necessary, yet you hold them to be no Condition of our Justification at first, neither indeed are they afterward, as that of *Gen.* 15. 6. with *Rom.* 4. 2, 3. doth irrefragably prove.

Your Argument I thus retort, [He that is justified, is in a State of Salvation, and should be saved, if he so died. But he that hath Faith without VVorks, is justified; *Ergo*, he is in a State of Salvation, and if he so die, shall be saved]. Answer for your self as you please: for my part I say, The same Faith which receiveth Christ as Priest, and so justifieth, is ready also to receive Christ as Lord, when he is so propounded; even as that Faith, which justifieth, is ready to produce Works, when they are required.

84. 1. You should not only suppose, but prove, that the excluding of Obedience from Justification (as co-partner with Faith in justifying) is a Scandal given, and an Error.

2. If it were not *Paul*'s design to advance Faith above Love, &c. in point of Justification, what then means his so frequent asserting Faith to be that whereby we are justified, and his never-mentioning Love, &c. to that purpose?

3. Your self acknowledg an aptitude in Faith to justifie as apprehending Christ, and I acknowledg, that besides this God hath appointed Faith for that purpose, in respect of its aptitude, making choice of it rather than of any other Grace.

Ibid. I have also oft enough considered what you have said. *Justificatio* (saith *Davenant*) *purgat, & abluit à reatu & pœnâ peccati, idque uno momento, & perfectè. De Justit. Habit. cap.* 23. *ad Arg.* 4.

Though Justification be perfect, as freeing from all Condemnation; yet so long as there may be Accusation, there is need of Justification. Whereas you speak of the Law justifying, &c. *It is God that justifieth*, Rom. 8. 33. though according to the Gospel or New-Covenant,

(for

(for that, I presume, you mean by the Law) and by the imputation of Christ's Righteousness. Christ as our Advocate doth plead our Cause, and procure our Justification; and at the Last Judgment, as God's Vicegerent, he will publickly pronounce Sentence.

I see nothing against me, but that still you run upon this Supposition, That there is the same Condition of Salvation, and of Justification at Judgment, whereas I suppose that VVorks are a Condition of Salvation, as full and compleat, but not so of Justification at Judgment, that being but a manifestation of our present Justification, and so VVorks looked at but as Fruits and Evidences of Faith, whereby we are justified. If *Illyricus* his Doctrine were the same with this, his fellow-Protestants (I dare say) would not blame him for it. Neither do I see how *Illyricus* could, or any rational Man can grant VVorks to be necessary Fruits of Faith, and yet deny them to be means or Conditions of Salvation, in respect of the actual and full enjoyment of it. For surely as Faith it self is required that we may be justified, so the Fruits of Faith (to be produced in due season) are required that we may be glorified. But why do you thus still jumble together Justification and Salvation, saying, [Illyricus *his Error was in denying Works to be necessary to Justification and Salvation?*] Yet when you cite *Bucer* and *Melancthon* as asserting the necessity of good VVorks, there is not a syllable in them about Justification, as if VVorks were necessary in that respect. *Ibid.* & 85.

Bucer in that Conference at *Ratisbon*, which you cite, though he maintain Inherent Righteousness, (as who doth not?) yet he saith, *Hâc justitiâ nemo justificatur coram Deo justificatione vitæ*, as he is cited by *Lud. de Dieu* in *Rom.* 8. 4. *ubi plura vide.*

So *Melancthon* is cited by *Bellarmine* as holding with other Protestants of prime note, that, *Sola fides justificat, & tamen fides quæ justificat, non est sola.* *De Justif. lib.* 1. *c.* 14.

And *Wotton* saith, (*De Recoucil. Part* 2. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. *Num.* 4.) Luthérus, Melancthon, Calvinus, Chemnitius, *ea potissimum causâ nos infusâ & inhærente justitiâ justificari non posse contendunt, quòd illa in nobis ita imperfecta sit, ut in Dei conspectum, quum ad judicandum*

candum accedat, prodire non audeat. But of *Bucer* and *Melanchthon* more by and by.

For *Illyricus*, what in other places he may hold I cannot tell, but in the Centuries (whereof he was the chief Author) he seems to agree with other prime Protestants; For he brings in 27 Arguments, whereby the Apostles (he saith) prove, *Hominem solâ fide absque operibus Legis justificari*; Among which the 23d is this; *Duæ sunt tantum viæ ad salutem, & nulla est tertia, &c. Una harum est per opera Legis; altera est per fidem in Christum, qui pro nobis Legem implevit. Sed illa, quæ est per opera Legis, postulat à nobis integerrimam implètionem, quam quia nemo potest præstare, omnes damnantur à Lege. Ea verò quæ per fidem est, gratis propter opera Christi, donat justitiam & vitam credentibus. Qui ergò vult per opera salvari propria, is alteram viam tollit; & è contrà, qui vult per fidem salvari gratis, is non potest per opera sua justificari. Gal.* 5. (perhaps it should be *Gal.* 3.) *Rom.* 4. & 10. *Ephes.* 2.

Cent. 1. *lib.* 2. *c.* 4. *Col.* 253, *&c.*

Here he seems indeed to confound Justification and Salvation, as if there were the same reason of both, and Works were no more required unto Salvation than unto Justification. But surely by Salvation he meant a Right unto Salvation, which doth necessarily go along with Justification; and whatsoever it be that doth justifie, the same also doth give a right unto Salvation. For otherwise he makes Works and new Obedience necessary to the full enjoyment of Salvation.

For he treats at large *de novâ obedientiâ seu bonis operibus justificatorum*; and he goes through the several Commandments, and brings in a Catalogue of Good Works which are required in every Commandment.

Ibid. Col. 279, *&c.* *Ibid. Col.* 283, *&c.*

Though he sometimes only expresseth these Reasons, why new Obedience and good Works must be performed, *ut glorificetur Deus, & inserviatur proximo, & sint testimonia veræ fidei*; yet even these reasons do imply that new Obedience and good Works are necessary unto Salvation, *viz.* in that sense as I have explained. For can any think to be saved, except they have a care to glorifie God, to serve their Neighbour, and to give testimony of their Faith?

Ibib. Col. 279.

But

But sometimes he speaks more expresly to this purpose, saying, *Iis qui fide gratis acceperunt remissionem peccatorum, Apostoli etiam de novitate vitæ concionantur, & pœnas comminantur rursus sese peccatis sine pœnitentiâ polluentibus.* *Ibid. Col. 349, &c.*

And among other places he alledgeth that *Phil. 2. Cum timore & tremore vestram ipsorum salutem operamini.*

And among other reasons, Why all must repent and walk in newness of Life, he brings in this as the sixth; *Subitus extremi judicii adventus*; And cites that *1 Joh. 2. Manete in eo, ut cum apparuerit, fiduciam habeamus, & non pudefiamus in adventu ejus:* And that *1 Thess. 5. Ipsi planè scitis, quòd dies ille Domini, ut fur in nocte, ita venturus sit: Cum enim dixerint, Pax & tuta omnia, tunc repentinus eis ingruet interitus, sicut dolor partus mulieri prægnanti, &c. Proinde ne dormiamus, &c.*

And for the next reason he brings in this; *Pœna æterna impœnitentium*, citing Rom. 2. *Juxta duritiam tuam & cor pœnitere nescium, colligis tibi ipsi iram in die iræ, quo patefiet justum judicium Dei, &c. Ventura est indignatio, ira, afflictio, & anxietas adversus omnem animam hominis perpetrantis malum, &c.*

This (I think) is sufficient to shew that *Illyricus* (at least when he helped to write the Centuries) was as much for Obedience and good Works as either *Bucer* or *Melanchthon*, for any thing that I see you cite out of them, and that he made them so Fruits of Faith, whereby we are justified, and have right to Salvation, that withal he made them Means or Conditions of Glorification; and more than this the words of *Bucer* and *Melanchthon* do not import.

Whereas you say, that *Davenant*'s words, which I cited, have nothing that you dislike, save only that Grace is said to be infused *in ipsa actu justificandi*, which yet you shew how it is not to be disliked; you consider not for what end I cited those words, *viz.* To shew that all Protestants generally acknowledg and profess, (so he, *Omnes enim agnoscimus, & clarè profitemur*) that Inherent Righteousness doth go along with Imputed Righteousness, though it be this and not that by which we are justified; and consequently, That Works are necessa-

ry

ry as Fruits of Faith, and Means of Salvation, though yet Works have no Copartnership with Faith in justifying.

Neither *Bucer* nor *Melanthon*, nor any of our famous Divines that I know, did teach other Doctrine. And because you seem to carry it so as if *Melanthon* and *Bucer* had been of your Opinion; though what I have said already may suffice to shew the contrary, yet I will add a little more.

Tom. 1. loc. de bonis Oper. *Melanthon* saith; *Planè & clarè dico, Obedientia nostra, hoc est, justitia bonæ conscientiæ seu operum, quæ Deus nobis præcepit, necessario sequi reconciliationem debet.*

But here he saith no more for Works than generally Protestants do; he is far from making them concurrent with Faith unto Justification.

Ibid. de Vocab. Fid. Again; *Sed nos (inquit) sciamus suum locum esse justitiæ operum, longè verò aliâ consolatione opus esse in quærendâ reconciliatione.*

Ibid. And again; *Cum dicitur, fide justificamur, non aliud dicetur, quàm quòd propter Filium Dei accipimus remissionem peccatorum, & reputamur justi. Et quia oportet apprehendi hoc beneficium dicitur fide, i. e. fiduciâ misericordiæ promissæ propter Christum. Intelligatur ergo propositio correlativè, Fide sumus justi, i. e. per misericordiam propter Filium Dei sumus justi seu accepti.*

Tom. 2. de Eccles. p. 133. And he alledgeth *Basil*, saying; *Sine ullâ sophisticâ detrahit justificationem bonis operibus; nec loquitur de cæremonialibus, sed de omnibus virtutibus; nec tantùm loquitur de operibus ante renovationem, sed de virtutibus in renovatis, ac jubet sentire, quòd solâ fiduciâ misericordiæ propter Christum promissæ justi sumus. —— Hæc est (inquit Basilius) perfecta & integra gloriatio in Deo, quando ne quidem propter justitiam suam aliquis effertur, sed agnoscit sibi deesse veram justitiam, fide autem solâ in Christum justificari, &c.*

In Præfat. Enerrat. Epistolæ ad Rom. *Bucer* also commends *Melanthon* for saying; *Sola fide justificamur, solius misericordiæ fiduciâ justi pronuntiamur.*

And presently he adds; *Nemini siquidem pio dubium esse potest, quin per solam Dei misericordiam, propterque*

quæ unius Christi meritum, ac nulla omnino nostra quamlibet sancta opera, & germanissimos Spiritus fructus, nos justificemur, hoc est, à Deo justi pronuntiemur.

1. I am sorry to see you so bent to maintain what you have once done. Is it fair to take hold on a few words of an Author, and to pass by that which immediately followeth, and shew that he meant quite contrary to what is pretended? Is not this to make your self guilty of that which you accuse others of, *viz.* to take up some scraps against the meaning of the whole Book, and even the very Page out of which you take them? 85.

2. I think nothing is more clear, than that Mr. *Ball*'s words following those which you cited, gainsay your Opinion, *viz.* of Works concurring with Faith unto Justification. For he expresly saith, That Faith alone justifieth, and that Works do but testifie and give proof, that Faith is lively.

Is not this the very thing that I so much contend for? And yet you stick not to say, That he yeeldeth Faith and Works to be the Condition of Justification, as if they were Copartners in this respect, whereas he ascribeth Justification wholly to Faith, and excludeth Works from having any concurrence with it in justifying. A little before the place by you cited, he opposeth those who make Faith and Works the Condition, without which Remission cannot be obtained, and saith it is impossible to conceive how Faith and Works should be conjoyned as Con-causes in Justification, seeing Faith attributes all to Free-Grace, and Works challenge to themselves. And a little before that again he saith, [*We read of two ways of Justification, by Faith, and by Works, but of a third manner, by Faith and Works both, as joint Causes, or Con-causes, we find nothing in Scripture*]. As he makes Faith to be more than a bare Condition, if by [Condition] be meant only *Causa sine quâ non*, so do I: yet he doth use the words [Condition] and [Instrument] promiscuously, and doth sometimes call Faith the one way, sometimes the other. He supposeth also, That if Works concur with Faith unto Justification, they are Con-causes, and not such Conditions as are only *Causæ sine quibus non*, as you seem to take it. Of the Coven. p. 70. *Ibid.* p. 69.

3. You say that you allow of the Explicatory terms, as I judg them. Why? then you allow of this, [Faith alone

alone doth juſtifie]; yea, [as it embraceth the promiſe of free forgiveneſs in Jeſus Chriſt]; for ſo immediately Mr. *Ball* doth explain himſelf. And for this very reaſon he denies Works to juſtifie, becauſe [*Works do not embrace Chriſt*]: Your diſtinction of Inchoated and Continued Juſtification, will here ſtand you in no ſtead. For beſides that Mr. *Ball* ſpeaks of Juſtification ſimply conſidered, it's certain that Works neither at firſt nor afterward concur with Faith in embracing the promiſe of free-forgiveneſs in Jeſus Chriſt: and therefore if Faith juſtifie in this reſpect, (as Mr. *Ball* ſaith it * doth, and you ſeem to give your approbation of what he ſaith) ſurely both at firſt and afterward Faith alone doth juſtifie: though Works appear in their ſeaſon, yet they do not concur with Faith unto Juſtification.

Of the Coven. p. 70.

* *And* p. 71. *he proves it, becauſe in Scripture every where Faith in Chriſt, in the Lord Jeſus, or the Blood of Chriſt, is ſaid to juſtifie, not Faith in other Promiſes, Threatnings, or Commandments.*

4. That which you cite out of Mr. *Ball*, p. 20. doth not reach home to your purpoſe. To ſay, as he there doth, [*A diſpoſition to good Works is neceſſary to Juſtification*], is no more than to ſay, A lively and working Faith, or a Faith apt and ready to Work, is neceſſary unto Juſtification. So when he ſaith, [*Good Works of all ſorts are neceſſary to our continuance in the ſtate of Juſtification, and ſo to our final abſolution, if God give opportunity*]; he meaneth only this, that Works are neceſſary Fruits of that Faith by which we lay hold on the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and ſo are juſtified and abſolved. [*The Faith that is lively* (ſaith he) *to embrace Mercy, is ever conjoyned with an unfeigned purpoſe to walk in all well-pleaſing, and the ſincere performance of all holy Obedience, as opportunity is offered, doth ever attend that Faith whereby we continually* (*N. B.*) *lay hold on the Promiſes once embraced. Actual good Works of all ſorts* (*though not perfect in degree*) *are neceſſary to the continuance of Actual Juſtification, becauſe Faith can no longer lay claim to the Promiſes of Life, than it doth virtually or actually lead us forward in the way to Heaven*]. It is clear, that as well afterward as at firſt, he aſcribes Juſtification only to Faith, as being only that which doth embrace the Promiſes, though he require a working Diſpoſition at firſt, and Works themſelves afterward

Of the Coven. p. 21.

ward, as opportunity ſerveth, to teſtifie and give proof that Faith is lively, * as he expreſly ſpeaketh. The words which you further add, I have cited before, and they are directly againſt you, ſhewing that as I and others take the word [Condition] Faith is the only Condition of Juſtification, and Works no part of it. And ſee what Mr. *Ball* addeth immediately after thoſe words, [*Faith and Works are oppoſed in the Matter of Juſtification, not that they cannot ſtand together in the ſame Subject, for they be inſeparably united, but becauſe they cannot concur or meet together in one and the ſame Court, to the Juſtification or Abſolution of Man*]. That which you cite from *p.* 21. is not to be underſtood (as you ſeem to take it) of actual walking, but of a diſpoſition to walk, as he ſaid *p.* 20. [*A diſpoſition to Works*, &c.] This diſpoſition is the qualification of that Faith, or always conjoined with that Faith, whereby we are partakers of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. This plainly appears to be his meaning, both by the words immediately going before, and alſo by the words in the preceding Page, both which are already cited.

* Of the Coven. p. 73.

1. If Perſonal Righteouſneſs be not perfect, but have need of pardon for the imperfection of it, then there is no being juſtified by it. This very reaſon *Luther*, *Melanchon*, *Calvin*, and *Chemnitius* give, why we cannot be juſtified by Inherent Righteouſneſs, as I noted before out of *Wotton de Recon. part* 2. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 19. *num.* 4. And to this purpoſe I alſo have cited before the words of *Calvin*, *Davenant*, *Ameſius*, *Rivet* and *Maccovius*. As for the Metaphyſical Perfection of Being, which you ſpeak of, it is but ſuch as doth belong to things that are moſt imperfect. And for *Praſtatio Conditionis N. Legis*, it is not (as I have ſaid before) properly that Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified, though it be required to that end, that we may be partakers of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and ſo (*viz.* by that Righteouſneſs of Chriſt) be juſtified. 2. Of Juſtification *quàm continuationem*, *& Sententiam Judicis* (*nempe in ultimo Judicio*) enough hath been ſaid before. Neither *Calvin*, nor any of our famous Divines, (that I know) nor yet the Scriptures (ſo far as I can find) do teach, that we are juſtified by Faith alone at firſt, but by Faith and Works afterward; yea I have ſhewed the contrary both from the Scriptures, and from our Divines; yet they both teach, That Faith whereby we are (both at *Ibid.*

firſt

first and afterward) justified, hath in it at first a readiness to Works; and afterward doth work, as opportunity is offered. *Quid commerita est Fides (inquit* Maccovius) *in progressu vitæ, ut tantum non possit, quantum in initio? Ergone ingenium fides mutaverit, &c. De Justif. Disp.* 10. See *Calvin Instit. lib.* 3. *cap.*14. §.11. and *Rivet* in *Gen.*15. *Exercit.* 83. *pag.*404. *Col.*1. Whereas you say that *Calvin* maintaineth a true Personal Righteousness; What is that to the purpose? Who doth not so? If that were all that you bade see *Calvin* for, truly you might soon cite Authors good store: but (as *Martial* speaks) *Dic aliquid de tribus capellis.* Shew that either *Calvin*, or any Judicious Orthodox Divine doth hold such a Personal Righteousness, as whereby we are justified: both *Calvin* and all our eminent and approved VVriters (that I know) deny this Personal Righteousness to be available unto Justification. Yea, and so do some of chief account in the Church of *Rome*. *Contarenus*, a Cardinal, to this purpose you may find cited by *Amesius contra Bellar. Tom.*4. *lib.*5. *cap.*1. *Thes.*1. *Pighius* also, a great Romish Champion, is as clear and full for this as may be. *In illo (inquit* fc. *Christo) justificamur, non in nobis; non nostrâ, sed illius justitiâ, qua nobis cum illo communicantibus imputatur. Propria justitia inopes, extranos in illo docemur justitiam quærere.* Much more he hath to the same purpose, and herein doth so fully agree with Protestants (though about Faith, as being that alone whereby the Righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, he dissents from them); that *Bellarmine* having recited the Opinion of Protestants, saith, (*De Justif. lib.*2. *cap.*1.) *In eandem sententiam, sive potius errorem incidit Albertus Pighius*; he adds also, *Et Authores Antididagmatis Coloniensis.* And for *Pighius* he saith further, *Bucerus in libro Concordiæ in articulo de Justificatione, fatetur Pighii sententiam non dissentire à Lutheranorum sententiâ, quod attinet ad causam formalem Justificationis, sed solùm quantum ad causam apprehensivum, quam Lutherani solam fidem, Pighius dilectionem totius quam fidem esse definit.* Here by the way observe, That *Bucer* (if *Bellarmine* did truly relate his Opinion, though not his only) made Christ's Righteousness imputed to us, the formal Cause of Justification, and Faith the only apprehensive Cause: and that therefore he was far from making us to be justified by our Personal Righteousness, & from making Works concurrent with Faith unto Justification; but that otherwise is evident enough by what hath been cited before out of him. The truth of my Conclusion (I think I may well conclude) is firm and clear, *viz.* That according to *Calvin* (and so *Bucer* and all our famous Writers) Personal Righteousness is not that whereby we are justified. What colour you can have to

De Fide & Just.

except

except against this Conclusion, to say it is merely my own, is to me a wonder.

Ibid. Repentance and Love to Christ are not excluded from our first Justification, yet have they no co-interest with Faith in Justifying; Faith, not Repentance, or Love being *Causa apprehensiva* (as *Bucer* and other Protestants do speak) that which doth apprehend Christ's Righteousness, by which so apprehended we are justified. Neither is it denied, that outward Works are requisite, that we may continue justified here, and be sententially (solemnly and openly) justified at the last Judgment: yet it follows not that Justification as continued and consummated at Judgment, is by Works, as concurring with Faith unto Justification. It is the Righteousness of Christ apprehended by Faith, by which we are justified from first to last, only this Faith being of a working Nature, we cannot continue justified, nor shall be (*i.e.* declared to be) justified at the last Judgment, except we have Works to testifie and give proof that our Faith is lively, as Mr. *Ball* before cited doth express it: but thus also it will follow, that Works being wholly wanting, we never had a Justifying Faith, nor were at all justified.

86. 1. That the Qualification of Faith is part of the Condition of Justification, so that Faith alone, as apprehending Christ and his Righteousness, is not the Condition (or Instrumental Cause, for I do not take Condition for *Causa sine quâ non*, but for that which hath some causality in it) you have not proved. The Condition of our Justification is that we believe in the Lord Jesus Christ; this presupposeth a desire of him, and inferreth a delight in him, and submission to him; yet it is only believing in him, by which we are justified. 2. Though the taking of Christ for King be as Essential to that Faith which justifieth, as the taking of him for Priest, yet not to Faith as it justifieth. Of *Fides quæ*, and *Fides quâ justificat*, as also of taking Christ for King, and taking him for Priest, I have said enough before. 3. I mean that Faith only justifieth, as it receives Christ as Priest, thô that Faith which justifieth doth receive Christ as King also. 4. If it be (as you grant) Christ's Satisfaction, and not his Kingship (or Sovereignty) which justifieth meritoriously, then (as far as I am able to judg) it is our apprehending of Christ's Satisfaction, and not our submitting to his Sovereignty, by which we are justified. The Act of Justifying Faith, as Justifying (me-thinks) can extend no further than to that Office of Christ, in respect of which he justifieth; or than as Christ is our Righteousness, by which we are justified; Christ as Advocate doth only justifie by pleading his Satisfaction for us, and our interest in it, and as Judg, by declaring us to be justified by it: and all this *secundum fœdus novum*, which is the ground of our Justifi-

cation. 5. I ſo confeſs Faith to be the Condition of Juſtification, that nevertheleſs I hold it to juſtifie as apprehending Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, God having in that reſpect required Faith of us, that we may be juſtified. And herein (as I have ſhewed before) I have Mr. *Ball* and other Judicious Divines agreeing with me, who call Faith a Condition of Juſtification, and yet make it to juſtifie as it apprehendeth Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs.

Ibid. My words clearly ſhew my meaning, *viz.* That Juſtification as it is begun by Faith alone, ſo it is continued, ſo that Obedience hath no more influence into our Juſtification afterward than at firſt. Juſtifying Faith at firſt is Obediential, *i. e.* ready to bring forth the Fruit of Obedience; and afterward, as there is opportunity, it doth actually bring forth the ſame; yet both at firſt and afterward it is Faith and not Obedience by which we are juſtified.

Ibid. 1. I have alſo oft enough told you, that you bring nothing of any force to prove Sentential Juſtification at Judgment a diſtinct kind of Juſtification, or any more than a declaration and manifeſtation of our preſent Juſtification. 2. For the Texts which you alledged, you do not anſwer what I objected. You alledged them to prove, That we are juſtified compleatly and finally at the Laſt Judgment, by perſeverance in faithful Obedience. I objected, That they ſpeak of Juſtification, as it is here obtained, and ſo make not for your purpoſe; to this you ſay juſt nothing, only you ſeem to ſay ſomething to thoſe words in the end of the *Animadverſion*, [*They ſhew who are juſtified, not by what they are juſtified*]; but that which you ſay, is of ſmall force. For none can truly ſay as much of the Texts alledged for Faith's Juſtifying, ſeeing that thoſe Texts expreſly ſay, That we are juſtified by Faith, and that Faith is imputed unto us for Righteouſneſs, which the other Texts do not ſay of Obedience.

Ibid. 1. Did you never underſtand my meaning about Faith's juſtifying until now? Nay, you ſeem not yet to underſtand it. Doth not Faith juſtifie at all, if it only juſtifies Inſtrumentally and Relatively? Is this ſo ſtrange unto you, that when we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith, it is meant in reſpect of the Object, *viz.* Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs, which is indeed that by which we are juſtified, though it muſt be apprehended by Faith, that we may be juſtified by it? Where is now the *totus mundus Theologorum Reformatorum*, which ſometime you ſpake of? My acquaintance in this kind is not ſo great (I think) as yours, yet I have before alledged many to this purpoſe. I will here add one more, a Man of note, Dr. *Prideaux*, (*Lect. 5. de Juſt. f.* §. 11, 14, 16.) *Juſtificamur* (*inquit*) *per juſtitiam Chriſti, &c. Atqui Fides ex parte noſtrâ hanc juſtitiam ſic a Deo imputatam, apprehendit ſolummodo & applicat; quia neque Charitati, vel ſpei, vel*

alteri

alteri habitui hoc munus competat. And again, *Justificat primò Deus Pater admittendo, & imputando. 2. Deus Filius, Satisfaciendo, & advocatum agendo. 3. Spiritus Sanctus revelando & obsignando. 4. Fides apprehendendo & applicando. 5. Opera, manifestando & declarando.* And again, *Anima vertere potuit Bertius, nos non propriè justificationem fidei attribuere, sed metaleptice, quatenus objecti actus propter arctam connexionem inter illum & habitum, usitatâ Scripturæ phrasi, in habitum transfertur.* 2. For Christ's Righteousness justifying formally, or being the formal cause of Justification, I have shewed in what sense some of our Divines do hold it, and some reject it, and that the difference is rather in words, than in the thing it self. 3. To me it seems no obscurity to say, [Faith or Believing doth justifie, because Christ's Righteousness, except it be apprehended by Faith, is not available to Justification]. Is not this as much as Faith doth justifie Instrumentally, or as apprehending Christs Righteousness by which we are justified? The reason why Christ's Righteousness cannot justifie, except it be apprehended by Faith, is this, That God doth require Faith of us; Faith (I say) apprehending Christ and his Righteousness, [*Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ*] that so we may be justified. God's Will is properly the Cause, yet there is a congruity in the thing it self, an aptitude (you grant) in the nature of Faith: it is of an apprehensive Nature, and its apprehending of Christ's Righteousness (the Will of God still presupposed) doth make this Righteousness ours, even as a Gift becomes ours by our receiving of it. If *Davenant*'s words, which I cited, be not against you, then nothing that I can say is against you. For I cannot express my own mind, as to that point, more clearly and fully than he doth. I will repeat his words again; (*De Justit. Habit. cap.* 28.) *Nihil restatius quàm causa applicanti illud tribuere, quod propriè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Quia igitur fides apprehendit, & applicat nobis justitiam Christi, id fidei ipsi tribuitur, quod reapse Christo debetur.* Is not this against you, who say, *Append.* p. 120. [*Faith is a Work and Act of ours; and if Faith justifie as an apprehension of Christ, it justifieth as a Work?*] Do not these words of *Davenant* tell you, that it is not *Causa applicans*, but *res applicata*; not *Fides*, but *Christus fide apprehensus* that doth justifie? Faith then is said to justifie, yet not in respect of it self, but in respect of its Object: it is not properly Faith apprehending, or the apprehension of Faith, but Christ and his Righteousness apprehended, by which we are justified. Much hath been said before to this purpose. If this be nothing against you, I know not how in this particular to say any thing against you: if it be against you, surely it is nothing but what that Reverend Author saith in the words cited. And mark (I pray) upon what occasion

he brings in those words. *Bellarmine* (*De Justif. lib.2, cap.9.*) saith that *Calvin*, from *Rom.4. Ubi dicitur fidem Abrahæ imputatam esse ad justitiam*, gathers, *nihil esse aliud nostram justitiam (nempe quâ justificamur) quàm fidem in Christum, id est, (N.B.) Christi justitiam Christi fide apprehensam.* Against this he objects, *Apostolus dicit ipsam fidem imputari ad justitiam: fides autem non est justitia Christi, &c.* To this *Davenant* answers, *Sed frivola est hæc objectio. Nam nihil usitatius quàm causa applicanti, &c.* Your Objection is the very same in effect with *Bellarmine's*; so that if *Davenants* words be any thing against *Bellarmine*, they are as much against you. And truly as you put off the words of *Davenant*, so you might with the same ease have answered all my *Animadversions*, and so you may all these Exceptions, by saying, That they are not against you. It is a strange faculty that you seem to have, of making any thing for you, as when you bid see *Calvin* on *Luk.1.6.* and nothing against you, as here in this place.

Ibid. When Mr. *Manton* speaketh of Faith Justifying as a Relative Act, his words immediately before (which I also cited) shew his meaning, *viz.* That Faith justifieth in its relation to Christ, as it receiveth Christ: so that not every Act relating unto Christ, but that which doth so relate unto him as to receive him, is that which justifieth: but what I say of the Act justifying, must always be understood in the sense before explained. That Faith in respect of its apprehensive nature, is more than *Causa sine quâ non*, to me is clear; it is *Causa applicans*, as *Davenant* in the words even now cited doth call it. 2. To contend much about Faith's Instrumentality, I do not like; I mean in respect of the word [*Instrumentality*], so that we agree in the matter; yet as our best Divines have used the word, I see not but it is convenient to be used. 3. I grant that it is a material question, Whether it be the receiving of Christ only as Priest that doth justifie; for the confounding of Christ's Offices, and of the Acts of Faith (as Mr. *Blake* before cited saith well) is not to be endured. But I see no necessary dependance of this question upon the other, *viz.* Whether Faith justifie as an Instrument, a sole-working Instrument, or as an Ordinance, or Relative Action required on our parts; which Mr. *Manton* said is all to the same issue and purpose, and so I think it is.

87. For the distinction of God's Will, you might at first apprehend what I meant, though perhaps my Expressions were not altogether so clear as afterward; neither indeed do you seem to speak so clearly of it in your *Aphorisms*. 2. How pertinent those Testimonies which you speak of are, I cannot tell; but truly as you cited *Calvin* on *Luk.1.6.* it is no hard matter to cite many. 3. What you alledg out of *Davenant*,

nant, I might evade, by saying as you did, That it is not against me; but I will not put you off so. I answer therefore, *Ad* 1. [*Bona opera sunt necessaria omnibus fidelibus, & justificatis, qui habent usum rationis, & per ætatem operari possunt*]. *Ita sanè res habet: quid negat? Sed num ideò bonis operibus aquè ac fide justificamur? Adverte, quæso ipsa authoris tui verba.* [*Bona opera sunt necessaria justificatis*], *non justificandis. Nam* (*ut scitè* Augustinus) [*Bona opera sequuntur justificatum, non præcedunt justificandum. Quid quod tuipse fateris, nos fide absque operibus in initio justificari? Ita, inquies, sed posteà ut justificati simus, opera etiam à nobis requiruntur.* *At* Davenantius *istud non dicit, non iis certè verbis quæ citasti. Jubes autem legere sequentia; lego igitur,* [*Facile est hujusmodi opera multa* (*præsertim interna*) *commemorare sine quibus justificatio nunquam fuit ab ullo mortalium obtenta, nunquam obtinebitur*]. *Sed ne hic quidem dicit opera ista pariter ac fidem justificari. Ea enim, quæ ad justificationem requiruntur, cum iis quæ justificant, confundi non debent, ut benè monet* Amesius. *Quin & ipse* Davenantius *latum discrimen facit inter Fidem & Opera, cum Fidem ideò justificare dicat, quod justitiam Christi apprehendat, ac nobis applicet. Id enim Fides peculiare est, nec Operibus ullo modo tribui potest. Ex* Davenantii *igitur sententia, non partim fide, partim operibus, sed fide solâ justificamur. Ad* 2. That Conclusion is the same in effect with the former. Some internal Works must go before Justification, yet they do not therefore justifie as well as Faith. *Davenantius eo ipso loco negat opera necessaria esse ad justificationem, ut causas, sed tantùm ut ab obtinendam Equestrem dignitatem necessarium est adire aulam regiam, atque coram rege in genua se dimittere. Fidem autem* (*loco alio, atque alibi citato*) *dicit esse causam applicantem justitiam, Christi, atque ideò ei tribui, quod proximè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam; Fidem nempe dici justificare, cum propriè justitia Christi fide apprehensa justificet; id quod ego mordicus teneo. Ad* 3. *De retinendo scilicet, & conservando Justificationis statu, anteà satis responsum est. Id nunc dico* Davenantium *nec in principio Justificationis, nec in progressu ejus vim virtutémque justificandi operibus juxta ac Fidei tributre, etiamsi dicat bona opera ad Justificationis Statum retinendum & conservandum esse necessaria; id quod ego libenter agnosco. Cum enim in ipso Justificationis exordio Fidem operibus gravidam esse oporteat, procedente demum Justificatione Fidem opera parere necesse est. Ad* 4. *Dico te extra oleas vagari, cum ego de Conditione Justificationis loquar, atqui isti-*

De fide & operibus, cap. 14.

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. l. 5. c. 5. §. 1.

De Justit. Hab. cap. 24. Arg. 8.

usmodi

uſmodi quidem Conditione, quâ juſtificari dicimur, tu autem oppo-nis mihi duthoterem deoperibus juſtificatorum (i.e. Eorum, qui jam juſtificati ſunt, & fidè quidem, non operibus, ex authoris iſtius ſententiâ) ad ſalutem neceſſariis differentem. The Pages to which you further refer me, I cannot conſult, my Edition differing from yours, as you might perceive by ſome places which I cited. But your Inference is of no force, as having no ground for it, *viz.* That if I will be of *Davenant*'s mind, I muſt be of yours. I do not ſee that *Davenant* doth attribute as much to Works as you do, who hold that they juſtifie, and urge the words of St. *James* for it, whereas *Davenant* (as I have ſhewed) makes Faith to juſtifie as apprehending and applying Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, which ſurely Works cannot do. He ſaith alſo, *Opera ſequuntur Juſtificationem, & præcedunt Glorificationem,* being not acquainted (it ſeems) with your diſtinction of Juſtification as Inchoated, and as Conſummate at Judgment, whereby you would have Works to be as well a Condition of Juſtification, as of Glorification. What *Davenant* doth mean when he calleth Faith an Inſtrument, he doth ſufficiently ſhew, making Faith to have a Cauſality in Juſtifying, by apprehending and applying Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, by which we are juſtified. But do our greateſt Divines give as much to Works as you do? This you will undertake (you ſay) to manifeſt. Why? then make it appear, that they hold Works to juſtifie as well as Faith, or to have a co-intereſt with Faith in the Effect of Juſtifying. Except you perform this, (which I preſume you never will) you cannot make good your Undertaking. So do our greateſt Divines give more to Faith than you. As you urge the τὸ μόνον of St. *James* for being juſtified by Works, ſo you alſo inſiſt upon the very Letter of St. *Paul*, and will have Faith it ſelf to be properly our Righteouſneſs, by which we are juſtified: This our greateſt Divines do not no more than the other. Yet you ſtick not to brand them, as making Man his own Juſtifier and Pardoner. Πῶν ἐκ ὑπερβατοῦ μέγα ἔρχεται ὄδυνον; Truly this is overgroſs. What profeſſed Adverſary could reproach our greateſt Divines more than thus? Whither will not a Man's partiality carry him, if he be let alone? May you not as well ſay, That Chriſt made ſome their own Saviours, becauſe he ſaid, That their Faith had ſaved them? I had thought that all the Glory did belong to the principal Agent, rather than to the Inſtrument. And to what purpoſe do you ſay, [*Who can forgive ſins but God only?*] Do they that make Faith an Inſtrument of Juſtification, deny this any more than you, who make both Faith and VVorks Conditions of it?

De Juſtit. Act. cap. 32.

Yea,

Yea, ſome will have that *Monſtrum horrendum*, and firſt-born of Abominations (as they phraſe it) to be laid at your own door. For my part I ſhall ſay no more than this, That you ſeem as guilty this way your ſelf, as they whom you cenſure, though neither you nor they (I think) are indeed guilty in this kind. Mr. *Kendal* againſt Mr. *Goodwin*, *cap.4.p.140.*

But why may not Man's Act be an Inſtrument of God's Act? Or to ſpeak more properly, Man acting be an Inſtrument of God acting? We are workers together with God, 2 *Cor.* 6. 1. Surely not in a way of Co-ordination, but in a way of Subordination; and ſo Man may be God's Inſtrument. I am not therefore of your mind, but think, that the Goſpel rather is properly a Means, and Miniſters Inſtruments: though to be nice and curious about words, ſo that the Matter be ſound and good, I do not love.

Ibid. & 88. 1. That Faith doth juſtifie, as it apprehendeth Chriſt, *appello totum Mundum Theologorum Reformatorum*; I have given you enough to this purpoſe before. Now to your Reaſons why this is to ſet up τὸ *Credere*, I anſwer; *Ad* 1. Not *Apprehendere & Credere ſimpliciter*, but *Apprehendere & Credere in, i. e. Apprehendere Chriſtum, & Credere in Chriſtum*, are all one. And when it is ſaid, That this doth juſtifie, the meaning is, *Chriſtus fide apprehenſus juſtificat*: ſo that this doth not ſet up τὸ *Credere*, as ſome do ſet it up, who make it as our Act ſimply conſidered, to be that Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified. *Ad* 2. Their meaning is not obſcure, as you pretend, that you may the better oppoſe it. The Object of Faith, Chriſt's Righteouſneſs apprehended by Faith, doth juſtifie: and ſo Faith is ſaid to juſtifie, not as conſidered in it ſelf, but in reſpect of its Object, which it apprehendeth, becauſe it apprehendeth that, *viz.* Chriſt's Righteouſneſs which doth juſtifie. *Ad* 3. The formal reaſon why Faith doth juſtifie, is its Apprehenſion, yet ſtill that is in reſpect of the thing apprehended, *Cauſa applicantis illud tribuitur quod immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Id fidei ipſi tribuitur, quod reapſe Chriſto debetur*, as *Davenant* before cited doth expreſs it, whoſe words you ſaid were not againſt you, though none can be more in this Matter.

For the ſecond Point you are quite miſtaken. For I do not put a difference betwixt Juſtification and Right to Salvation, but betwixt Juſtification and Salvation it ſelf, *i. e.* the full enjoyment of it, *viz.* Glorification. I have frequently expreſſed my ſelf to this effect, That by Faith alone we are juſtified, and ſo have Right to Salvation; yet by VVorks and Obedience alſo we muſt come fully to enjoy Salvation.

In

In hoc Fœdere (ſcil. Evangelico, ſaith *Davenant, De Juſtit. Actual. cap.* 30. *pag. mihi* 396.) *ad obtinendam reconciliationem, juſtificationem, atque æternam vitam, non alia requiritur Conditio, quam vera & viva fidei.* Preſently after he explains himſelf thus; *Juſtificatio igitur, & jus* (*N. B.*) *ad æternam vitam ex Conditione ſolius Fidei ſuſpenditur.*

By the way you may obſerve how he calls Faith the Condition, and the only Condition of our Juſtification, and yet he makes it not to be *Cauſa ſine quâ non*, but *Cauſa Inſtrumentalis & Cauſa applicans*, as appears by his words before cited. Your following Arguments are not againſt me, you do but fight (as they ſay) with your own ſhadow. Yea, you having objected againſt your ſelf, *Rom.* 5. 10. You anſwer directly as I uſe to do, *viz.* That *Paul* doth not diſtinguiſh betwixt Reconciliation and a Right to Salvation, but betwixt Reconciliation and actual (and Compleat) Salvation. You add, That *Paul* makes them both Fruits of Free Grace. And what Proteſtant (ſay I) doth not ſo? A neceſſity of good Works, as the way of attaining unto Salvation is aſſerted, yet it is denied that good VVorks are meritorious of Salvation. That in *Rom.* 8. 6. (whence you infer, That only Faith is not the Condition) proves not that Faith alone is not the Condition of Juſtification and Right to Salvation, which is all that I contend for. VVhat you mean by thoſe words [*Life as well as Righteouſneſs*] I do not know. Neither do I ſee what thoſe Verſes, 13, 14, 17. (*viz.* of *Rom.* 8.) are for your purpoſe. VVhereas by the way you ſay, [*Faith juſtifies, not* qua Inſtrumentum, vel Apprehenſio proximè, ſed qua Conditio præſtita, *becauſe Juſtification is given as a Reward; and Rewards are given on Moral Conſiderations, and not merely Phyſical*]; I have told you before, That I alſo include a Moral Conſideration, and do not make Faith to juſtifie merely as it is of ſuch an apprehenſive Nature, but as being of ſuch a Nature, God therefore in that reſpect hath been pleaſed to make choice of it for that end, that by it, apprehending Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs (*i. e.* properly by Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs apprehended by it) we ſhould be juſtified.

FINIS.